

PROPERTY OF
~~STERN~~ BIBLE INSTITUTE LIBRARY

HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY;
INCLUDING THAT OF
THE POPES
TO
THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOLUME VI.

~~PROPERTY OF~~
~~NORTHEASTERN BIBLE INSTITUTE LIBRARY~~
~~ESSEX FELLS, NEW JERSEY~~

NEW YORK:
SHELDON AND COMPANY.

BOSTON: GOULD AND LINCOLN.

M DCCC LXI.

Santa Clara College
The Master's College
Library
CA 91322-0878

#3256

RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY
H. O. HOUGHTON.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SIXTH VOLUME.

BOOK XI.

CHAPTER I.

ST. LOUIS.

A.D.		PAGE
	Character of St. Louis.....	16
1226	Blanche of Castile — Youth of St. Louis.....	<i>ib.</i>
	His virtues.....	21
1246	Preparations for Crusade.....	22
1249	Crusade.....	25
1250	Defeat and Captivity.....	26
	Ransom and Release.....	29
1252	Return to Europe.....	31
	Contrast between St. Louis and Frederick II.....	<i>ib.</i>
1232-44	Code of Inquisition.....	32
	Insurrection against Inquisition.....	35
1239	Persecution in France.....	37
1260	Pragmatic Sanction.....	40

CHAPTER II.

POPE ALEXANDER IV.

1254	Election.....	41
	Manfred.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Edmund of England King of Sicily.....	42

A.D.		PAGE
1250	Boniface Archbishop of Canterbury.....	45
1258	The Senator Brancalone.....	47
	Manfred King of Sicily.....	50
1259	Eccelin da Romano.....	52
	Alberic da Romano.....	54
	The Flagellants.....	55
1251	The Pastoureaux.....	57
	The Mendicant Friars.....	63
1231-52	University of Paris.....	64
	William of St. Amour.....	68
	The Everlasting Gospel.....	71
	The Perils of the Last Times.....	74

CHAPTER III.

URBAN IV. — CLEMENT IV. — CHARLES OF ANJOU.

1261	Election of Urban IV.....	80
	State of Italy.....	83
	Charles of Anjou.....	85
	Ugo Falcodi Legate in England.....	87
1264	Death of Urban IV.....	91
	Pope Clement IV.....	<i>ib.</i>
1265	Charles of Anjou at Rome.....	93
	Battle of Benevento.....	95
	Tyranny of Charles.....	98
	England — Simon de Montfort.....	99
	Reaction.....	104
	Council of London.....	105
1267	Conradin.....	107
	Henry of Castile.....	110
1268	Conradin in Italy — Defeat and death.....	113
	Death of Clement IV.....	117

CHAPTER IV.

GREGORY X. AND HIS SUCCESSORS.

A.D.		PAGE
	More than Two Years' Vacancy in the Popedom...	118
1268	Pragmatic Sanction.....	119
1270	Death of St. Louis.....	122
1271-2	Gregory X.....	123
1273	Rodolph of Hapsburg Emperor.....	127
1274	Council of Lyons.....	129
	Law of Papal Election.....	131
1276	Death of Gregory X.....	133
	Rapid Succession of Popes — Innocent V. — Hadrian V. — John XXI.....	<i>ib.</i>
1277	Nicolas III.....	135
	Greeks return to Independence.....	137
1280	Schemes and Death of Nicolas III.....	141
	Martin IV.....	143

CHAPTER V.

SICILIAN VESPERS.

	Tyranny of Charles of Anjou.....	147
	John of Procida.....	151
1282	Sicilian Vespers.....	155
	Revolt of Sicily.....	157
	Siege of Messina.....	160
	Peter of Arragon King of Sicily.....	162
	Martin condemns the King of Arragon.....	166
1283	Challenge — Scene at Bordeaux.....	168
1285	Death of Charles of Anjou, of Philip of France, and Martin IV.....	171
	Honorius IV.....	172
1288	Nicolas IV.....	173

A.D.		PAGE
	Nicolas and the Colonnas.....	178
1292	Death of Nicolas IV.....	179

CHAPTER VI.

CÆLESTINE V.

	Conclave.....	181
1293	Peter Morrone — Cœlestine V. Pope.....	183
	Inauguration in Naples.....	188
	Abdication.....	194
	Jacopone da Todi.....	196

CHAPTER VII.

BONIFACE VIII.

1294	Election of Boniface.....	204
1295	Boniface at Rome — Inauguration.....	205
	Persecution of Cœlestine.....	207
	Death and Canonization.....	209
	Early Career of Boniface.....	210
1295-1302	Affairs of Sicily and Naples.....	214
1297	The Colonnas.....	222
	Boniface and Italy.....	230
1292	Adolph of Nassau Emperor.....	231
1298	Death of Adolph — Albert of Austria.....	236

CHAPTER VIII.

BONIFACE VIII. — ENGLAND AND FRANCE.

	England — Development of Constitution.....	238
	France — The Lawyers.....	240

A.D.		PAGE
	Edward I. and the Clergy.....	241
1294	Quarrel between France and England.....	246
	Pope commands a Truce.....	248
	Taxation of Clergy in England.....	249
	Statute of Mortmain.....	250
	France — Philip taxes the Clergy.....	258
1296	The Bull “Clericis Laicos”.....	259
	England — Parliament at Bury.....	260
	Council in St. Paul’s.....	261
	Confirmation of the Charters.....	264
	Philip’s Edict.....	266
	The Bull — Ineffabilis.....	268
	The King’s reply.....	271
1297	Pope’s Prudence.....	273
1298	Arbitration of Boniface — Peace.....	277
1299	Scotland — Interference of Boniface.....	279
1300	Jubilee.....	284

CHAPTER IX.

BONIFACE VIII.—HIS FALL.

	Boniface at the height of his power.....	287
	Dangers — The Franciscans.....	288
	The Fraticelli.....	291
	Charles of Valois.....	294
1301	England — Parliament of Lincoln.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Claims of England and Scotland.....	296
	Quarrel of Boniface and Philip of France.....	298
	Philip’s Alliance with the Empire.....	303
	Rumors about Boniface.....	304
1301	Bishop of Pamiers.....	305
	Court-plenary at Senlis.....	308
	Peter Flotte.....	<i>ib.</i>
	The Lesser Bull.....	313
	Bull, <i>Ausculat fli</i>	315
1302	Bull burned.....	318

A.D.		PAGE
	States General — Addresses to the Pope.....	318
	Consistory at Rome.....	324
	Bull, Unam Sanctam.....	326
	Battle of Courtrai.....	327
	Philip condemns the Inquisition.....	329
	Meeting at the Louvre — Twelve Articles.....	331
	The King's answer.....	334
1303	Parliament at the Louvre.....	336
	William of Nogaret.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Papal despatches seized.....	340
	Second Parliament — Charges against Boniface....	<i>ib.</i>
	The King's Appeal.....	345
	General adhesion of the kingdom.....	347
	Boniface at Anagni.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Excommunication.....	349
	Attack on the Pope.....	351
	Rescue of the Pope.....	355
	Death of Boniface.....	356

CHAPTER X.

BENEDICT XI.

Election of Benedict XI.....	359
Measures of Benedict.....	361
Bull of Benedict.....	365
Death of Benedict.....	367

BOOK XII.

THE POPE IN AVIGNON.

CHAPTER I.

CLEMENT V.

A.D.		PAGE
1304-5	Conclave.....	371
1305	Bernard de Goth.....	373
	Election — Coronation of Clement V.....	375
	His first acts.....	376
	William of Nogaret.....	377
1307	Meeting at Poitiers.....	381
	The Templars.....	384
	Du Molay at Poitiers.....	394
	Accusations against the Order.....	397
	Arrest of the Templars.....	398
	Specific charges.....	400
	Tortures.....	402
	Interrogations — Confessions.....	404
	The Pope.....	408
	Templars in England.....	410
1308	Death of the Emperor — Henry of Luxemburg Em- peror.....	412
	Parliament of Tours.....	415

CHAPTER II.

1309	Process of the Templars — Commission opened at Paris.....	423
	Du Molay.....	427
1310	Others brought to Paris.....	432
	Defenders — Proctors chosen.....	435
	Witnesses.....	440

A.D.		PAGE
	Confessions.....	443
	Archbishop of Sens.....	444
	Burning of the relapsed.....	446
	Templars in England.....	455
	Hearings in London.....	458
	Templars in Scotland and Ireland.....	468
	in Italy.....	469
	in Spain.....	471
	Difficulty of the question.....	473
	Historians.....	479
	Abolition of the Order.....	481

CHAPTER III.

ARRAIGNMENT OF BONIFACE — COUNCIL OF VIENNE.

1310	Prosecution of memory of Pope Boniface.....	484
	Pope Clement at Avignon.....	485
	Consistory — Charges.....	490
	Witnesses.....	492
	Summary of evidence.....	499
	Papal judgment.....	500
1311	Council of Vienne.....	504

CHAPTER IV.

HENRY OF LUXEMBURG — ITALY.

	The Pope.....	510
	Affairs of Italy.....	512
1310	Henry of Luxemburg in Italy.....	514
1311	Crowned at Milan.....	515
1312	Advance from Genoa to Rome.....	519
	Coronation.....	520
1313	Death of Henry.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Dante de Monarchiâ.....	521

CHAPTER V.

END OF DU MOLAY — OF POPE CLEMENT — OF KING PHILIP.

	PAGE
Burning of Du Molay.....	527
Death of Clement.....	529
Death of Philip IV.....	534
Teutonic Order.....	535

BOOK XI.

CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

POPES.		EMPERORS OF GERMANY.		KINGS OF FRANCE.		KINGS OF ENGLAND.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1254 Alexander IV.	1261	1249 William	1256				
		(Conrad)					
1261 Urban IV.	1265						
1265 Clement IV.	1269	1256 Interregnum	1273	Louis IX.	1270		
1269 Vacancy	1271			1270 Philip the Hardy	1285	Henry III.	1272
1271 Gregory X.	1276	1273 Rodolph of Hapsburg	1291			1272 Edward I.	1307
1276 Innocent V. Hadrian V. John XIX.							
1277 Nicolas III.	1281					ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.	
1281 Martin IV.	1285					1244 Boniface of Sa- voy	1272
1285 Honorius IV.	1289			1285 Philip the Fair	1314	1272 Robert Kil- wardby	1278
1289 Nicolas IV.	1292	1291 Adolph of Nas- sau	1298			1278 Robert Peck- ham	1294
1292 Vacancy	1294						
1294 Celestine V. Boniface VIII.	1303	1298 Albert of Austria	1308			1294 Robert Winchel- sey	1313
1303 Benedict X.	1305						

KINGS OF SCOTLAND.		KINGS OF SPAIN.		KINGS OF SWEDEN.		EASTERN EMPIRE.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
		CASTILE.				LATIN.	
Alexander III.	1286	1252 Alfonso XI., the Wise	1284	1250 Waldemar	1276	Baldwin II.	1261
1286 Interregnum	1292	1284 Sancho IV.	1295	1276 Magnus II.	1282		
1292 John Balliol		1295 Ferdinand IV.	1312	1282 Birger II.		GREEK.	
						1255 Theodorus	1258
1301 Interregnum						1258 John IV.	
		ARRAGON.					
		James I.		KINGS OF DENMARK.		1259 Michael (Paleo- logus)	1283
		Alfonso X.	1276				
		1276 Pedro III.	1285	A.D.	A.D.	1283 Andronicus II. (Paleologus)	
		1285 Alfonso III., the Beneficent	1291	1252 Christopher	1259		
		1291 James II., the Just	1312	1259 Eric VII.	1263		
				1263 Olaus IV.	1280		
		KINGS OF PORTUGAL.		1280 Eric VIII.			
		A.D.	A.D.	1302 Hakim II.			
		Alfonso III.	1279				
		1279 Dionysius I.					

HISTORY OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

BOOK XI.

CHAPTER I.

ST. LOUIS.

THE great fabric of mediæval religion might have suffered a shock from the haughtiness, the rapacity, the implacability of Innocent IV., which had raised a deep and sullen alienation even among the clergy in parts of Christendom, especially in England and Germany. The Teutonic pride revolted at the absolute nomination of an obscure prince to the Empire by the will of the Pope. The bold speculations, the enlightened studies, promoted by Frederick II., even the contemptuous indifference ascribed to him, though outwardly rejected, were working no doubt in the depths of many minds. Heresy, crushed in blood in Languedoc, was spreading elsewhere the more extensively in defiance of the Inquisition, which was already becoming odious throughout Europe. The strife of the new Orders with the clergy had weakened their influence over the popular mind, influence not altogether replaced by the wonderful numbers, activity, learning, ubiquity of the Mendi-

cants. In the Franciscan Order had already begun that schism, which was of far greater importance than is commonly supposed in religious history.

But there was not wanting the great example of St. Louis. religion to awe and to allure mankind: it was not in the chair of St. Peter, not at the head of a new Order, but on the throne of France: the Saint of this period was a King. The unbounded admiration of St. Louis in his own days, the worship of the canonized Sovereign in later times, was a religious power, of which it is impossible to trace or define the limits. Difficult, indeed, it is to imagine that at the same historic period lived Frederick II. and Louis IX. Louis was a monk upon the throne, but a monk with none of the harshness, bitterness, or pride of monkery. His was a frank playfulness, or amenity at least of manner, which Henry IV. never surpassed, and a blamelessness hardly ever before, till very recent times never after, seen on the throne of France. Nor was he only a monk: he had kingly qualities of the noblest order, gentleness, affability, humanity towards all his believing subjects, a kind of dignity of justice, a loftiness of virtue, which prevented the most religious of men from degenerating into a slave of the clergy; a simple sincerity even in his lowest superstitions, an honest frankness, an utter absence of malignity even in his intolerance, which holds even these failings and errors high above contempt, or even aversion. Who can read the Seneschal Joinville without love and veneration of his master?

Louis was ten years old at the death of his father Louis VIII. His mother, Blanche of Castile, took possession at once of the regency.

A.D. 1226.
Blanche of
Castile

Her firm demeanor awed all ranks; her vigorous administration at once established her power. Philip the Rough, the brother of Louis VIII. (the son of Philip Augustus, by Agnes of Meran, but who had been acknowledged as a legitimate prince), submitted sullenly, yet submitted, to the female rule. It is strange to contrast the severe court of the Queen-mother Blanche with that of Marie de Medicis, or Anne of Austria; the youth of Louis IX. with that of Louis XIV. or Louis XV.: and to suppose that the same religion was preached in the churches, then by a rude Dominican or a homely Franciscan, afterwards in the exquisite and finished language of Bossuet and Massillon. Blanche of Castile did not entirely escape the malicious slanders of her enemies. She was accused of too close an intimacy with the Legate himself. She fell under stronger suspicion as the idol of the amorous poetry of the gallant Thiebault, Count of Champagne, afterwards King of Navarre. But Thiebault's Platonic raptures were breathed in vain to the inaccessible matron; it was the policy not the heart of the Queen Regent which led her not to disdain the poetic suit of a dangerous subject, constantly falling off to the enemies of her son, and recalled to his allegiance by the authority of his mistress. The historian guarantees her chaste and cleanly life.¹ Her treatment of her son showed no indulgence for such weaknesses. Once in his early youth he had looked with kindling eye on some fair damsels. "I had rather he were dead," said the rigid mother, "than that he should commit sin." Thus bred a monk, the congenial disposition of Louis embraced with ardor the austere rule. Had he not been early married, he

¹ "Sa vie bonne et nette." — Joinville.

would have vowed perpetual chastity. The jealousy of his mother of any other influence than her own was constantly watching his most familiar intercourse with his wife, Marguerite of Provence. He bore it, even the harshness with which Blanche treated her daughter-in-law at times when woman's sympathies are usually most tender, with the meekest filial submission. At all the great religious periods, Advent, Lent, the high Festivals, and all holy days (which now filled no small part of the year), the youthful King denied himself all connubial indulgences; he would rise from his bed, and pace the cold chamber till he was frozen into virtue. His other appetites he controlled with equal inflexibility. Besides the most rigorous observance of the ordinary fasts, once only in the year would he allow himself to taste fruit: he wore the roughest sackcloth next to his skin. His spiritual teachers persuaded him to less severe observance, to deny himself only unripe fruit, to wear haircloth of less coarse texture. On Fridays he never laughed; if he detected himself in laughter he repressed and mourned over the light emotion. On Friday he never changed his raiment. In his girdle he wore an ivory case of iron-chain scourges (such boxes were his favorite presents to his courtiers), not for idle display. Every Friday during the year, and in Lent on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, he shut himself up in his chamber, searching every corner, lest any one should be present, with his confessor, the Dominican Godfrey of Beaulieu. The bleeding shoulders of the King attested his own sincerity, and the singular adulation of the confessor, who knew the King too well not to administer the discipline with unsparing hand. These more secret acts

Austerities
of Louis.

of holiness were no doubt too admirable for the clergy to allow them to remain secret; but the people were no less edified by his acts of public devotion. It was his constant practice to visit distant churches with bare feet, or, to disguise his piety, in sandals without soles. On every altar he offered profuse alms. One day he walked barefoot from Nogent l'Erembert to the church of Our Lady at Chartres, a distance of four leagues; he was obliged to lean on his attendants for support. He constantly washed the feet of beggars; he invited the poor and the sick to his table; he attended the hospitals, and performed the most menial and loathsome offices. A leper on the farther side of a swamp begged of him; the King crossed over, not only gave him alms, but kissed his hand. He heard daily two, sometimes three or four, masses; his whole day might seem one unbroken service; as he rode, his chaplain chanted or recited the offices. Even in this respect his teachers attempted to repress his zeal. A Dominican preacher urged him from the pulpit not to lower too much the royal dignity, not to spend the whole day in church, to content himself with one mass: "whoever counselled him otherwise was a fool, and guilty of a deadly sin." "If I spent twice as much time in dice and hawking, should I be so rebuked?"¹ answered the gentle King. He bore even reproach with meekness. A woman named Sarrette, pleading in the King's court, said "Fie! you are not King of France; you are only a king of friars, of priests, and of clerks. It is a great pity that you are King of France; you should be turned out of the kingship."² The blessed King

¹ Notices et Extraits, ix. 406.

² Life, by the Confessor of Queen Margaret, in Bouquet, p. 366.

would not allow his attendants to chastise the woman. "You say true! It has pleased the Lord to make me king; it had been well if it had pleased him to make some one who had better ruled the realm." He then ordered his chamberlain to give her money, as much as forty pence.

Louis had the most religious aversion for all lighter amusements, the juggler, the minstrel. He was profoundly ignorant of polite letters. His whole time might seem fully occupied in rehearsing over and over the same prayers; yet he is said to have read perpetually in a Latin Bible with devotional notes, and to have been deeply versed in the writings of some of the Fathers, especially St. Augustine. But this learning, whatever it might be, he acquired with the most reverential humility; it tempted him to no daring religious speculation, emboldened him to no polemic zeal. "Even clerks, if not profoundly learned, ought to abstain from controversy with unbelievers; the layman had but one argument, his good sword. If he heard a man to be an unbeliever, he should not dispute with him, he should at once run that sword into his entrails, and drive it home."¹ He related with special approbation the anecdote of a brave old knight, who broke up a discussion on the relative excellence of their law between some Catholic doctors and some Jewish Rabbis by bringing down his mace upon the head of the principal Jew teacher. Louis loved all mankind with a boundless love except Jews, heretics, and infidels, whom he hated with as boundless hatred.

¹ "Mais l'omme loy (laic) quand il ot mesdire de la ley crestienne, ne doit desputer a eulz, ne doit pas defendre la ley crestienne, ne mais (si non) de l'espee, de quoi il doit donner parmi le ventre dedans, tant comme il peut entrer." — Joinville, in Bouquet, t. xx. p. 198.

But above all these weaknesses or exaggerated virtues there were the high Christian graces, ^{His virtues.} conscientiousness such as few kings are able or dare to display on the throne, which never swerved either through ambition or policy from strict rectitude. No acquisition of territory, no extension of the royal power, would have tempted Louis IX. to unjust aggression. He was strongly urged to put to death the son of the chief of the rebels in arms against him, the Count de la Marche, who had fallen into his hands; he nobly replied: "A son could not refuse to obey his father's orders." The one great war in which he was involved, before his departure for the Crusade, which ended in the humiliation of the great vassals of the Crown and of the leader in that revolt, Henry III. of England, the chief of these great vassals, was provoked by no oppression or injustice on his part, was conducted with moderation unusual in that age; and his victory was not sullied by any act of wanton revenge or abuse of power. He had no rapacity; he coveted but one kind of treasure, relics; and no doubt when he bought the real crown of thorns (the abbey of St. Denys had already boasted their possession of the authentic crown, but their crown sank into obscurity, when that of Constantinople arrived in Paris),¹ when he obtained this inestimable prize at such enormous cost, there was no abstemiousness which he would not have practised, in order so to enrich his beloved France. He plundered the Jews, but that was on religious grounds; their tainted wealth might not infect the royal treasury; he bestowed the whole on Baldwin of Constantinople.

Yet Louis was no slave of the hierarchy. His relig-

¹ Compare Tillemont, *Vie de Saint Louis*, ii. 337.

ion was of too lofty a cast to submit to the dictates of a worldly clergy. His own great objects of admiration were the yet uncorrupt Mendicants, the Preachers and Minorites; half his body he would give to St. Dominic, half to St. Francis. He once gravely meditated the abandonment of his throne to put on the weeds of one of these Orders. His laws will afterwards display him, if not as the founder, the assertor of the liberties of the Gallican Church, and of the royal power, as limiting that of the Papacy. Throughout the strife between Frederick II. and Gregory IX. he maintained an impartial and dignified neutrality. He had not declined the summons of the Emperor to hold a meeting of the temporal Sovereigns of Christendom to resist in common the encroachments of the spiritual power. Nothing could surpass the calm loftiness with which he demanded the release of the French prelates taken at the battle of Meloria; he could advance the cogent argument, that he had resisted all the demands and entreaties of the Pope to be permitted to levy subsidies on the realm of France for the war against the Emperor. He had refused, as we have seen, the offer of the Imperial crown from Innocent IV. for his brother; only when Frederick threatened to march on Lyons, and crush the Pope, did Louis seem disposed to take up arms for the defence of the Pontiff.¹

Such a monarch could not but be seized by the yet unexpired passion for the Crusade. Urban II., two centuries before, would not have found a more ardent follower. It was in St. Louis no love, no aptitude for war, no boiling and impetuous valor. His slight frame and delicate health gave no

Louis determines on a crusade.

¹ Tillemont, iii. p. 164.

promise of personal prowess or fame; he was in no way distinguished in, he loved not knightly exercises. He had no conscious confidence in his military skill or talent to intoxicate him with the hopes of a conqueror; he seems to have utterly wanted, perhaps to have despised, the most ordinary acquirements of a general. He went forth simply as the servant of God; he might seem to disdain even the commonest precautions. God was to fight his own battles; Louis was assured of victory or Paradise. All depended on the faith, and the suppression of military license, at which he labored with fond hopes of success, not on the valor, discipline, generalship of the army. In his determination to embark on the Crusade, Louis resolutely asserted the absolute power of the monarch: in this alone he resisted the colder caution of his mother Blanche; she was obliged to yield to the pious stubbornness of her son. Louis was seized with an alarming illness, he had sunk into a profound lethargy, he was thought dead; a pious female had drawn the covering, in sad respect, over what seemed the lifeless corpse. Another gently withdrew it. The soft but hollow voice of the King was heard: "God has raised me from the dead: give me the Cross." His mother wept tears of joy; when she saw the Cross on his breast, she knew the meaning of that gesture. She shuddered as if he lay dead before her.¹

A.D. 1244.
Dec. 10

No expedition to the East was so ignominiously disastrous as that of St. Louis: yet none might seem to set forth under more promising auspices. He was three years in assembling his forces, preparing arms, money, horses, soldiers. It was in October (A.D. 1245) that in

¹ Joinville, p. 207.

the Parliament of Paris he publicly took the Cross. The princes, the nobles, vied in following his example; his brother, Robert of Artois, the Duke of Burgundy, the Duke of Brabant, the Countess of Flanders and her sons, Peter Mauclerc of Dreux and his son, the Count of Bretagne, the Counts of Bar, Soissons, St. Pol, de la Marche, Rhetel, Montfort; the Archbishops of Rheims, Sens, and Bourges, the Bishops of Beauvais, Laon, and Orleans, with countless knights and esquires. At Christmas in the same year Louis practised perhaps the only act of treachery of which he was guilty in his life. It was the custom for the King to distribute, as his gifts on that day, new robes to the courtiers. He ordered red crosses to be secretly embroidered between the shoulders; they were lavished in more than usual numbers. The courtiers were astonished to find that the King had thus piously enlisted them; they were now warriors of the Cross, who could not shrink from their engagement. It would have been indecent, disgraceful, ignoble, to throw aside the crosses; so, with true French levity, they laughed and wept at once, owning that they were completely entrapped by the King.

From that time the whole thoughts of Louis were absorbed in the Holy War. He resisted the offers of Pope Innocent to befriend him in a war against England, even in an invasion of England. He made, as A.D. 1246. he hoped, a lasting peace with his neighbor. He took no part in the confederacy of the French nobility to resist the exactions of the Pope and of the hierarchy.¹ He labored earnestly, though ineffectually, to reconcile the Emperor and the Pope.

¹ According to Paris, St. Louis favored the League. Compare Tillemont, iii. p. 120.

So far, on the other hand, had his strife with the Emperor absorbed all other religious passions in the Pope, that not only was there no cordial coöperation on the part of Innocent in the Crusade of St. Louis, but exemptions from the Crusades were now notoriously sold, it was believed to defray the expenses of the war against the Emperor. The Crusaders in Italy were urged to join the Pope's forces, with all the privileges and exemptions of a Crusade to the Holy Land.

Louis himself did not embark at the head of a great army, like a puissant monarch. The princes, ^{Louis embarks in the Crusade.} prelates, and nobles were to arrange their own transport. St. Louis passed down the Rhone; he was urged to avenge the death of his father on rebellious Avignon: "I have taken arms to revenge Jesus Christ, not my father." The island of Cyprus was the place of rendezvous. In Cyprus there was a delay of eight months. Want of discipline and a fatal epidemic made great ravages in the army; there seemed a total absence of conduct or command. But for supplies sent by the Emperor Frederick, there had been famine. The grateful Louis made one more effort to mediate between the Pope and the Emperor. The overture was contemptuously rejected.

At length the armament set sail; its object was the conquest of Egypt, as securing that of the ^{June 7, 1249.} Holy Land. Damietta was abandoned by ^(Cyprus.) the Saracens; the Crusaders were masters of that great city.¹ But never were the terror and advantages of a first success so thrown away. Months were wasted;

¹ The instant St. Louis landed and saw the Saracens, he drew his sword and was for charging them at once. The wiser "preudhommes" stopped him. This was St. Louis's notion of military affairs. — Joinville, p. 215.

the King was performing the offices of a monk, not of a general. Yet the army of the pious Louis was abandoned to every kind of Oriental luxury.¹ In June they were in Damietta, in November they marched,

June 20. and shut themselves in a camp in a corner be-
(Damietta.) tween the hills and the canal of Ashmoun.

The flying bands of the enemy, with the Greek fire, Feb. 8-11. harassed the camp. Good fortune and the valor of the soldiery extricated them from this difficulty, only to involve them in more fatal disasters. The King's brother, the Count of Artois, fell in a hasty unsupported advance. The unrivalled valor of the French was wasted in unprofitable victories, like those in Mansourah, or in miserable defeats. The camp was in a state of blockade; pestilence,² famine, did the work

Defeat and of the enemy. The King of France was a
captivity. prisoner to the Sultan of Egypt. Of two
March 27. thousand three hundred knights and fifteen
April 6. thousand pilgrims few made their escape. His brothers, Alfonse of Poitou and Charles of Anjou, shared his captivity. His Queen, far advanced in pregnancy, remained with an insufficient force in Damietta. She bore a son prematurely; she called his name "Tristan."

But it was adversity which displayed the great character of St. Louis. He was himself treated at first with courtesy; he was permitted to hear the canonical prayers, after the custom of the Church of Paris, recited by the single priest who had escaped; his breviary, the loss of which he deplored above all losses, was

¹ Not a stone's throw from the King the soldiers "tenoient leurs bordiaux." — Joinville, 217.

² They had no fish all Lent but "bourbettes," which gluttonous fish fed on dead bodies, and produced dreadful maladies.

replaced by another. But he had the bitter aggravation of his misery — that, of ten thousand prisoners in Mansourah, all who would not abandon their faith (and some there were guilty of this apostasy) met a cruel death. But to all the courteous approaches of the Sultan, Louis was jealously on his guard, lest he should compromise his dignity as a King or his purity as a Christian: he would not receive the present of a dress from the unbeliever. To their exorbitant demands and menaces he gave a calm and determined reply. They demanded the surrender of all the fortresses in Syria: these, it was answered, belonged not to the King of France, but to Frederick II. as King of Jerusalem. To that of yielding up the castles garrisoned by the Knights of the Temple and of St. John, the answer was that the Orders could not surrender them without violating their vows. The King was threatened with torture — torture of the most cruel kind — the barnacles, which crushed the legs. “I am your prisoner,” he said, “ye may do with me as ye will.”¹ It is said that he defied even the more degrading menace of carrying him about and exhibiting him as a spectacle in all the cities of Islam. At length more reasonable terms were proposed; the evacuation of Damietta, and a large sum of money — for the King’s ransom one million byzantines; for the captive Barons five hundred thousand French livres. Concerning his own ransom Louis made some difficulty; he acceded at once to that of the Barons. “It becomes not the King of France to barter about the liberty of her subjects.”² The Sultan,

¹ Joinville, p. 243.

² “Par ma foy larges est le Frans, quant il na pas bargigné (marchandé) sur si grant somme de deniers.” So said the Saracens. Joinville, 243.

Turan-Shah, was moved by the monarch's generosity ; with Oriental magnificence, he struck off one fifth — two hundred thousand byzantines — from his ransom.

In the new perils which arose on the murder of the Sultan Turan-Shah before the deliverance of the prisoners, the tranquil dignity of the King of France overawed even the bloody Mamelukes. The Emirs renewed the treaty ; the difficulty was now the oath. The King demanded, by the advice of Master Nicolas of Ptolemaïs, that the Mussulmans should swear, "that if they broke the treaty they should be dishonored as the Islamite who should go as a pilgrim to Mecca bareheaded, as one who should take back a divorced wife, as one who had eaten swine's flesh." A renegade suggested as an equivalent form to be required of the King, that in like case, should he violate the treaty, "he should be dishonored as a Christian who had denied God and his Holy Mother, and had severed himself from the communion of God, his Apostles, and Saints ; or, in mockery of God, had spat on the Holy Cross and trampled it under foot." Louis indignantly repelled the last clause. The Emirs threatened him with death ; he declared that he had rather die than live, after having insulted God and his Holy Mother.¹ His brothers and the other Barons followed the example of his firmness. In vain the Mamelukes seized the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who had come under the Sultan's safe conduct (which they disclaimed) into the camp, a man eighty years old, and tied him to a tent-post with his hands behind his back, till they swelled and almost burst. The Patriarch, in his agony, entreated the King to yield, and offered to take upon him-

Murder of
the Sultan
Turan-Shah.

¹ Joinville, p. 246.

self all the guilt of his oath. The oath was arranged, it is not known how, to mutual satisfaction ; but so rigidly scrupulous was Louis, that when it appeared that in the payment of part of the ransom the Christians might have gained an advantage, either fairly or unfairly, of ten thousand byzantines in weight, he peremptorily commanded the full payment.

The release of the King on such favorable terms, at a price so much below the value of such a ^{Ransom and} captive, astonished both the Christians and ^{release.} the Mussulmans. Damietta could not have resisted many days. Much was attributed to the awe inspired by the majestic demeanor and calm self-command of the King.¹ Joinville, his faithful seneschal and historian, had persuaded himself that the Emirs, after the murder of Turan-Shah, had determined to offer the crown of Egypt to the King of France ; they were only deterred by his stern Christianity, which would never have submitted to the toleration of their creed. The King himself declared to the Seneschal that he should not have declined the offer. Happily it was not made, probably was never contemplated ; the death of Louis would soon have vindicated the affront on Islam. But all this, no doubt, heightened the religious romance which spread in Europe around the name of Louis.

Notwithstanding his defeat and humiliation and captivity, the passive courage of Louis was still ^{Hopes of} unbroken ; he persisted, contrary to all coun- ^{Louis.} sel, in remaining in Palestine. He would not suppose that God would utterly abandon his faithful servants ;

¹ The Saracens, according to Joinville, said that if Mohammed had allowed such sufferings to be inflicted on them as St. Louis endured, they should have renounced him. — P. 247.

he would not believe that Christendom would be unmoved by his appeal ; he still would fondly expect that the irresolute Henry of England would fulfil his vow, and come to his rescue at the head of his whole realm.¹ To Henry the summons was earnest and repeated. Louis made the most advantageous overtures ; he even, to the indignation and disgust of his own subjects, offered the surrender of Normandy, to which England still laid claim as her King's hereditary dominions.² He still imagined that the Pope would lay aside all his plans for the humiliation of Frederick, and be compelled, by his own Apostolic character, and the general voice of Christendom, to sacrifice everything to the recovery of the Holy Land ; that there would be but one Crusade under his auspices, and that the legitimate

Deserted by his brothers. one. Louis was deserted by his brothers, whose light conduct had caused him great vexation ; while he was in perpetual self-mortification before God for his sins, which he did not doubt had caused his defeat and bondage, they were playing at dice, whiling away the hours with vain amusements. Almost all the Barons followed the Counts of Poitou and Anjou ; Louis was left almost alone with Joinville, his faithful Seneschal. Nor was his weary sojourn in Palestine enlivened by any brilliant successes or gallant feats of arms. For these Louis had neither the activity nor the skill. He was performing the pious office

A.D. 1251. of assisting with his own hands to bury the dead warriors. A hasty pilgrimage in sackcloth to

¹ Henry took the cross (March 6, 1251), says Tillemont, "soit pour piller plus librement ses sujets, soit pour quelque meilleur dessein." The Pope wrote to Henry early in 1251. Henry swore to go to the Holy Land in three years. — Paris, p. 834.

² Paris, 833, 834.

Nazareth was almost the only reward ; the only advantage of his residence was the fortification of Cæsarea, Ptolemais, and Joppa. The negotiations with the Sultan of Aleppo on one side, and the Egyptians on the other, by which he hoped to obtain the country west of the Jordan, came to nothing. He is said to have converted many Saracens ;¹ he spent enormous sums in the purchase of Mohammedan or heathen slaves, whom he caused to be baptized.²

It was only the death of the Queen-mother Blanche, and the imperious necessity for his presence in his kingdom of France, which forced him at last to leave the hallowed soil. He returned — if without fame for arms, or for the conduct of affairs — with the profoundest reverence for his sanctity. Only a few years before, Frederick II. had come back to Europe, leaving Jerusalem in the hands of the Christians ; the Christian power in Palestine, but for its own dissensions, formidable both to the Sultan of Egypt, and the Sultan of Damascus ; he had come back still under the sentence of excommunication, under the reproach with the Papal party of having basely betrayed the interests of the Cross and of God. Louis left Jerusalem unapproachable but with difficulty and danger by the Christian pilgrim, and the kingdom of Jerusalem visibly trembling to its fall ; yet an object of devout respect, having made some advance at least, to his future canonization.

The contrast between Frederick and Louis may be carried on with singular interest, as illustrative of their times. It might have been supposed that Louis would have been the re-

Return to
Europe.
Nov. 1252.

Further
Contrast of
Frederick
and Louis.

¹ Tillemont, from MSS., and Duchesne, p. 405.

² Ibid.

morseless persecutor of heretics ; Frederick, if not the bold assertor of equal toleration, which he allowed to Greeks and Mohammedans, would hardly have been the sovereign to enact and execute persecuting edicts, unprecedented in their cruelty, and to encourage the son to denounce the father.¹ Happily for Louis, his virtue was not tried by this sore temptation ; it was not under his government that the spiritual ravagers still wasted Languedoc. After the treaty by which Raymond VII., Count of Toulouse, surrendered his prin-
Louis escapes being a persecutor.
cipality, he remained with the barren dignity of sovereign, but without a voice in the fate of a large though concealed part of his subjects. Bishop Fulk of Toulouse, as far as actual power, was half sovereign of the land, and the council of that sovereign, which alone displayed administrative activity, was the Inquisition. Heresy had been extinguished as far as its public services ; but the Inquisition of Toulouse determined to root it out from the hearths, from the chambers, from the secret hearts and souls of men. The statutes of the Council of Lateran were too merciful. The Inquisition drew up its code of procedure,² a Christian code, of which the base was a system of delation at which the worst of the Pagan emperors might have shuddered as iniquitous ; in which the sole act deserving of mercy might seem to be the Judas-like betrayal of the dearest and most familiar friend, of the kinsman,

¹ See vol. v. p. 385.

² The two forms of procedure may be read in Martene and Durand. — *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, t. v. Their authenticity is beyond dispute. Nothing that the sternest or most passionate historian has revealed, nothing that the most impressive romance-writer could have imagined, can surpass the cold systematic treachery and cruelty of these, so called, judicial formularies.

the parent, the child. Though these acts belong neither to Frederick nor to Louis, they must find their place in our history.

The Court sat in profound secrecy ; no advocate might appear before the tribunal ; no witness was confronted with the accused : who were ^{Form of procedure.} the informers, what the charges, except the vague charge of heresy, no one knew. The suspected heretic was first summoned to declare on oath that he would speak the truth, the whole truth, of all persons whatsoever, living or dead, with himself, or like himself, under suspicion of heresy or Vaudism. If he refused, he was cast into a dungeon — a dungeon the darkest in those dreary ages — the most dismal, the most foul, the most noisome. No falsehood was too false, no craft too crafty, no trick too base, for this calm, systematic moral torture which was to wring further confession against himself, denunciation against others. If the rack, the pulleys, the thumbscrew, and the boots, were not yet invented or applied, it was not in mercy. It was the deliberate object to break the spirit. The prisoner was told that there were witnesses, undeniable witnesses against him ; if convicted by such witnesses his death was inevitable. In the mean time his food was to be slowly, gradually diminished, till body and soul were prostrate. He was then to be left in darkness, solitude, silence. Then were to come one or two of the faithful, dexterous men, who were to speak in gentle words of interest and sympathy — “ Fear not to confess that you have had dealings with those men, the teachers of heresy, because they seemed to you men of holiness and virtue ; wiser than you have been deceived.” These dexterous men were to speak of the Bible, of

the Gospels, of the Epistles of St. Paul, to talk the very language, the Scriptural language of the heretics. "These foxes," it was said, "can only be unearthed by fox-like cunning." But if all this art failed, or did not perfectly succeed, then came terror and the goading to despair. "Die you must—bethink you of your soul." Upon which if the desperate man said, "If I must die, I will die in the true faith of the Gospel"—he had made his confession: justice claimed its victim.

The Inquisition had three penalties: for those who recanted, penance in the severest form which the Court might enact; for those not absolutely convicted, perpetual imprisonment; for the obstinate or the relapsed, death—death at the stake, death by the secular arm. The Inquisition, with specious hypocrisy, while it prepared and dressed up the victim for the burning, looked on with calm and approving satisfaction, as it had left the sin of lighting the fire to pollute other hands.

Such was the procedure, of which the instructions may now be read in their very words, which Raymond of Toulouse must put in execution in his capital city. The death of the Bishop Fulk relieved him not; an A.D. 1231. inflexible Dominican sat on the episcopal seat of Toulouse. The Pope, Gregory IX., issued a bull, in which the Inquisition was placed in the inexorable hands of the Friar Preachers. Two inquisitors were appointed in every city; but the Bishops needed no excitement to their eager zeal, no remonstrance against mistimed mercy to the heretics. At the Council of Narbonne, presided over by the Archbishops of A.D. 1233. Narbonne, Aix, and Arles, was now issued a decree, that as there were not prisons vast enough to

contain those who, however they had made submission, were still unworthy of the absolution of the Church, and deserved imprisonment for life, further instructions must be awaited from his Holiness the Pope. But the contumacious, who refused to submit to imprisonment, or who broke prison, were to be at once made over to the secular arm. No plea was to be admitted to release from imprisonment; not the duty of the husband to the young wife, of the young wife to her husband; not that of the parents for the care of their children, nor of children for the care of their parents; infirmity, age, dotage, nothing excused, nothing mitigated the sentence. So enormous was the crime of heresy, the infamous, whose witness was refused in all other cases, were admitted against the heretic: on no account was the name of a witness to be betrayed.

But the most oppressed may be overwrought to madness. Witnesses were found murdered; even Rebellion. the awful persons of inquisitors were not secure. An insurrection broke out in the suburbs of Narbonne against the Prior of the Dominicans; the Archbishop and the Viscount of Narbonne in their defence suffered a repulse. The insurgents despised the excommunication of the Archbishop, and fought gallantly against the rest of the city, which espoused the cause of the Church. Albi was in tumult, even Toulouse arose. The two great inquisitors, William Arnaud and Peter Cellani, were compelled to leave the city. They marched out at the head of the thirty-eight members of the Inquisition, with the Bishop and the parish priests in solemn procession; they hurled back an excommunication. Count Raymond compelled the re-admission of the clergy, but even Rome was appalled: a

Franciscan was sent to allay by his gentleness the popular fury. The proceedings of the Inquisition (this merciful edict was purchased in Rome) were suspended for a time in Toulouse.¹

Five years passed. Raymond of Toulouse, under the shelter, as it were, of the wars between Louis IX. and Henry of England, and encouraged by hopes of support from the Spanish kings, aspired at the head of the league among the great vassals of the south to throw off the yoke of Northern France. The down-trodden Albigensians seized their opportunity. They met at Mirepoix, marched on the castle of Avignecourt, where William Arnaud, the great inquisitor, held his tribunal. Four Dominicans, two Franciscans, seven Familiars, the whole terrible court, were hewn to pieces. That which had thrown a dreadful grandeur over the murders perpetrated by the inquisitors, gave a majestic endurance to their own. They died like the meekest martyrs: they fell on their knees, crossed their hands over their breasts, and, chanting the *Te Deum*, as wont over their victims, they awaited the mortal blow.² They were not long unavenged. Raymond was forced to submit; his act of subjection to Louis IX. stipulated his abandonment of the heretics. Two years after, at another Council at Narbonne, it was enacted that the penitents, who had escaped from prison, should in mercy be permitted to wear yellow crosses on their garments, to appear every Sunday during mass, and undergo public flagellation: the rest were to suffer

¹ Martene, *Thesaur. Anecd.*, i. 992. *Vaissette, Hist. de Languedoc, Appendix xxv.*

² *Histoire de Languedoc, Preuves*, p. 438.

life-long incarceration. At the same time Mont Segur,¹ the last refuge of the Albigensians, a strong castle on the summit of a ravine in the Pyrenees, to which most of the Perfect with their Bishop had fled, was forced to surrender to the Archbishop of Narbonne, the Bishop of Albi, and the Seneschal of Carcassonne. All the heretics, with their Bishop and the noble lady, Esclarmonde, were burned alive in a vast enclosure of stakes and straw.² Of all these atrocities, however, Louis IX. was guiltless; he was not yet, or was hardly, of age, and his whole soul was absorbed in his preparation for his crusade. Even his brother, Charles of Anjou, who by obtaining the hand of the heiress of Provence (to which Raymond of Toulouse aspired) had become lord of that territory, took no active part in these persecutions.

Yet even in the realm of France a frightful holocaust was offered near the city of Rheims. In Persecutions in France. A.D. 1239. the presence of the Archbishop and seventeen Bishops, and one hundred thousand people, on Mont Aimé near Vertus, one hundred and eighty-three Manicheans (one Perfect alone) were burned alive with their pastor, who calmly administered absolution to them all. Not one but died without fear. But this execution took place in the territory and under the sanction of Count Thiebault of Champagne, not of the King; of Thiebault (the King of Navarre), whose Troubadour songs were as little respectful to the clergy, or the Papalists, as those of the other Languedocian bards.³ If even under Louis a monk held his court in Paris, and, unrebuked, inflicted death on many inno-

¹ Puy Laurent, c. 46.

³ Compare H. Martin, *Hist. de France*.

² *Ibid.*

cent victims, this seems to have been an exceptional case ; nor is it quite clear how far it had the concurrence of the King.¹

Yet for a time suspended, our comparison of Louis IX. and Frederick II. is not exhausted. As legislators there is the most striking analogy between these two, in so many other respects oppugnant sovereigns. The Sicilian laws of Frederick and the "Establishments" of St. Louis agree in the assertion (as far as their times would admit) of the absolute suprenacy of the law, the law emanating from the King, and in the abrogation (though Louis is more timid or cautious than Frederick) of the ordeal, the trial by battle, and the still stranger usage of challenging the judges to battle.

The Justiciaries of Frederick belonged to a more
Frederick and Louis as law-givers. advanced jurisprudence than the King himself, seated on his carpet in the forest of Vincennes administering justice.² But the introduction under his reign of the civil lawyers, the students and advocates of the Roman jurisprudence, into the courts of France (under Philip the Fair will be seen their strife, even triumph over the canon lawyers), gave a new character to the ordinances of St. Louis, and of far more lasting influence. The ruin of the house of Swabia, and the desuetude into which, in most respects, fell the constitution of Frederick, prevented Naples from becoming a school of Roman law as famous as that of Paris, and the lawyers of the kingdom of Sicily from rising into a body as powerful as those of France in her parliaments.

Both Kings, however, aimed at the establishment of

¹ Raynald, sub ann., i. p. 29. Hallam, i. 29, with his authorities.

² See the picturesque description in Joinville, p. 199.

equal justice. They would bring the haughty feudal nobles and even the churchmen, (who lived apart under their own law) under the impar-^{As to the nobles.}tial sovereignty of the law of the land. The punishment of Enguerrand de Couci for a barbarous murder attested the firmness of the King. The proudest baron in France, the highest vassal of the crown, hardly escaped with his life. So, too, may be cited the account of the angry baron, indignant at the judicial equity of the King — “Were I king, I would hang all my barons; the first step taken, all is easy.” “How, John of Thouret, hang all my barons? I will not hang them; I will correct them if they commit misdeeds.”

It was the religion, not the want of religion, in St. Louis which made him determine to bring^{As to the clergy.} the criminal clergy under the equal laws of the realm. That which Henry II. of England had attempted to do by his royal authority and by the Constitutions of Clarendon, the more pious or prudent Louis chose to effect with the Papal sanction. Even the Pope, Alexander IV., could not close his eyes to the monstrous fact of the crimes of the clergy, secured from adequate punishment by the immunities of their sacred persons. The Pope made a specious A.D. 1260. concession; the King's judge did not incur excommunication for arresting, subject to the judgment of the ecclesiastical courts, priests notoriously guilty of capital offences. Alexander threw off too from the Church, and abandoned as scapegoats to the law, all married clergy and all who followed low trades; with them the law might take its course, they had forfeited the privilege of clergy. But neither would Louis be the absolute slave of the intolerance of the hierarchy. The

whole prelacy of France (writes Joinville)¹ met to rebuke the tardy zeal of the King in enforcing the excommunications of the Church. "Sire," said Guy of Auxerre, "Christianity is falling to ruin in your hands." "How so?" said the King, making the sign of the cross. "Sire, men regard not excommunication; they care not if they die excommunicate and without absolution. The Bishops admonish you that you give orders to all the royal officers to compel persons excommunicate to obtain absolution by the forfeiture of their lands and goods." And the holy man (the King) said "that he would willingly do so to all who had done wrong to the Church." "It belongs not to you," said the Bishop, "to judge of such cases." And the King answered, "he would not do otherwise; it were to sin against God and against reason to force those to seek absolution to whom the clergy had done wrong."

The famous Pragmatic Sanction contained only the first principles, yet it did contain the first principles, of limitation as to the power of the Court of Rome to levy money on the churches of the realm, and of elections to benefices. It was, in fact, as the foundation of Gallicanism under specious terms of respect, a more mortal blow to the Papal power than all the tyranny, as it was called, exercised by Frederick II. over the ecclesiastics of the kingdom of Naples. Of this, however, more hereafter.

¹ P. 200.

CHAPTER II.

POPE ALEXANDER IV.

ON the death of Innocent IV., the Cardinal of Ostia, of the famous Papal house of Segni, was elected at Naples: he took the name of Alexander IV. He was a gentle and religious man, not of strong or independent character, open to flattery and to the suggestions of interested and avaricious courtiers.¹ Innocent IV. had left a difficult and perilous position to his successor. The Pope could not abandon the Papal policy: the see of Rome was too deeply pledged, to retract its arrogant pretensions concerning the kingdom of Naples, or to come to terms with one whom she had denounced as an usurper, and whose strength she did not yet comprehend. But Sinibald could not leave, with his tiara, his own indomitable courage, indefatigable activity, his power of drawing resources from distant lands. Alexander was forced to be an Innocent IV. in his pretensions; he could be but a feeble Innocent IV. The rapidity with which Manfred after his first successes overran the whole of the two Sicilies, implies, if not a profound and ardent attachment to the house of Swabia, at least an obstinate aversion to the Papal sovereignty. It seemed a general national outburst; and Manfred, by circum-

Accession of
Alexander IV.
Dec. 21,
A.D. 1254.

¹ Matt. Paris, sub ann.

stances and by his own sagacious judgment, having separated the cause of the hereditary kings from the odious German tyranny (the Saracen bands were less unpopular than the Germans), as yet appeared only as the loyal guardian of the infant Conradin. He was already almost master of Apulia; he was with difficulty persuaded to send ambassadors, as sovereign princes were wont to do, to congratulate the Pope. During the next year the legate of the Pope was in person at Palermo; the whole island of Sicily had acknowledged Manfred. His triumph was completed by Naples opening her gates; Otranto and Brundisium followed the example of the capital. Manfred ruled in the name of his nephew from Palermo to Messina, from the Faro to the borders of the Papal States. At the first it was evident that the weak army of the Pope, under the Cardinal Octavian, could not make head against this rising of the whole realm. Berthold of Homburg soon deserted the cause of the Pope.¹ Alexander was trammelled with the engagements of his predecessor, who, having broken off his overtures to Charles of Anjou, had acknowledged Edmund of England king of Sicily. The more remote his hopes of success, the more ostentatiously did Henry III. attempt to dazzle the eyes of his sub-

¹ See the curious letter in Matt. Paris, from which it appears that certain churches and monasteries in England were bound to merchants of Sienna in 2000 marks of new sterling money in favor of Berthold and his brothers. For acts of treason, Berthold and his brothers were declared to have forfeited their claim. But the churches and monasteries were still to discharge the 2000 marks. The Prior and monastery of Durham were assessed at 500 marks; Bath at 400; Thorney at 400; Croyland, 400; Gisburn, 300. Durham and Gisburn refused payment. This is dated Anagni, June 1256. There is also a letter (MS., B. M.) threatening excommunication against the Prior of Winchester and others, if they do not pay 315 marks to certain merchants of Sienna (sub ann. 1255, in init.).

jects by this crown on the head of his second son. Edmund appeared in public as King of Sicily, affected to wear an Italian dress, and indulged in all the pomp and state of royalty. The King himself, notwithstanding the sullen looks of his Barons, spoke as if determined on this wild expedition. His ambassadors, the Bishops of London and Hereford, the Abbot of Westminster, the Provost of Beverley, accepted the crown. It was agreed that, as Edmund was not of age, his father should swear fealty for him.¹ Yet England was less liberal than usual of subsidies either to the Pope or to the King for this senseless enterprise. The legate, a Gascon, Rustand, had already received a commission, with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Hereford, to levy a tenth on England, Scotland, and Ireland. The King had an offer of an exemption from his vow of a crusade to the Holy Land, on condition of his appearing at the head of an army to subdue Manfred in Apulia. Rustand himself preached in London and in other places; and made others preach a crusade against Manfred, the enemy of the Pope and of their Lord the King of England, a crusade as meritorious as that to the Lord's sepulchre. The honest English were revolted at hearing that they were to receive the same indulgences for shedding Christian as Saracen blood. Rustand received a rich prebend of York as reward for his services.

Year after year came the same insatiate demands:

¹ In Rymer, 1254, are the bulls or terms of grant of the kingdom of Sicily. See in MS., B. M. (viii. 195), letter to the King of England to pay 4800 livres Tournois (libras Turonenses)* for the expenses of W. terranus (Cardinal of Velletri) "electus de mandato f. m. Innocent IV. in servitium Ecclesiæ pro stante negotio regni Siciliæ."

* The livre Tournois was about 12 francs.

ambassador after ambassador summoned the King to fulfil his engagements; the Pope condescended to inform him through what merchants he could transmit his subsidies to Rome. The insolence and the falsehood of Rustand and the other legates, the Archbishop Elect of Toledo and the Bishop of Bologna, increased the exasperation. In the absence of the Primate of England, Rustand ruled supreme in the Church, and excommunicated refractory prelates, whose goods were instantly seized and confiscated to the King. They carefully disguised the successes of Manfred, and spread rumors of the victories of the Papal armies. The King had too much vanity and too much weakness to resist these frauds and violences. The King is said to have bound himself for two hundred thousand pounds sterling, besides fifty thousand levied by the Bishop of Hereford.¹ Even the Cistercian monks could not escape the unusual and acknowledged alienation of the English clergy from the see of Rome. The Pope, or the Nuncio of the Pope, had recourse to violent measures against the second prelate of the realm, Sewal, Archbishop of York. The words of the English historian show the impression on the public mind: "About that time our Lord the Pope laid his hand heavily on the Archbishop of York. He gave orders (by a measure so strong and terrible he would daunt his courage) that Sewal should be ignominiously excommunicated throughout England with the light of torches and tolling of bells. But the said Archbishop, taught by the example of Thomas the Martyr, the example and lessons of the saintly Edmund, once his master, by the faithfulness of the blessed

Sewal,
Archbishop
of York.
A.D. 1257.

¹ Rymer. MS., B. M., sub ann. 1235.

Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, did not despair of consolation from heaven, and patiently supported the tyranny of the Pope; for he would not bestow the abundant revenues of the Church on persons unworthy or unknown, from beyond the Alps, and scorned to submit himself, like a woman, to the Pope's will, abandoning his rights. Hence the more he was anathematized by the orders of the Pope, the more was he blessed by the people, though in secret for fear of the Romans."¹

But where all this time was the Primate of England, and who was he? On the death of the un-^{Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury.}worldly and sainted Edmund Rich, the King and the Pope had forced on the too obsequious, afterwards bitterly repentant, monks of Canterbury, a foreigner, almost an Italian. Boniface, Bishop of Bellay, was uncle to the Queen, and brother of that Philip of Savoy, the warlike and mitred body-guard of Innocent IV., who became Archbishop of Lyons. Boniface was elected in 1341, confirmed by Pope Innocent not before 1344. The handsome, proud prelate found that Edmund, however saintly, had been but an indifferent steward of the secular part of the diocese. Canterbury was loaded with an enormous debt, and Boniface came not to England to preside over an impoverished see. He obtained a grant from the Pope of first-fruits from all the benefices in his province, by which he raised a vast sum. Six years after, the Primate announced, and set forth on a visitation^{About Michaelmas, A.D. 1250.} of his province, not as it was said, and as too

¹ So writes Paris. "Falso pertinaciam illius constantiæ nomine exornat (M. Paris) cum *justè* Pontifex pro Sicilia, deposito tyranno, in Edmundum transferendâ, a clero Anglicano pecuniarum subsidia exigeret." Thus wrote Raynaldus in the 17th century. — Sub ann. 1257.

plainly appeared, for the glory of God, but in quest of ungodly gain. Bishops, chapters, monasteries must submit to this unusual discipline, haughtily and rapaciously enforced by a foreigner. From Feversham and Rochester he extorted large sums. He appeared in London, treated the Bishop (Fulk Basset of the old noble Norman House) and his jurisdiction with contempt. The Dean of St. Paul's (Henry de Cornhill) stood by his Bishop. The Primate appeared with his cuirass gleaming under his pontifical robes. The Dean closed the doors of his cathedral against him. Boniface solemnly excommunicated Henry Dean of St. Paul's and his Chapter in the name of St. Thomas the Martyr of Canterbury. The sub-Prior of St. Bartholomew's (the Prior was dead) fared still worse. He calmly pleaded the rights of the Bishop; the wrathful Primate rushed on the old man, struck him down with his own hand, tore his splendid vestment, and trampled it under foot. The Bishop of London was involved in the excommunication. The Dean of St. Paul's appealed to the Pope; the excommunication was suspended. But Boniface himself proceeded in great pomp to Rome. The uncle of the Queen of England, the now wealthy Primate of England, could not but obtain favor with Innocent. The Dean of St. Paul's was compelled to submit to the supreme Archbishopal authority. On his triumphant return Boniface continued his visitation. The Chapter of Lincoln, headed by the Archdeacon (Bishop Grostête was dead), resisted his demand to dispose of the vacant Prebends of the Church. The Archdeacon bore his own appeal to Rome. After three years he obtained (by what means appears not) what seemed a favorable sentence;

but died, worn out, on his way home. Boniface trampled on all rights, all privileges. The monks of Canterbury obtained a Papal diploma of exemption, Boniface threw it into the fire, and excommunicated the bearers. The King cared not for, the Pope would not regard the insult.

After the accession of Alexander IV. the Archbishop of Canterbury is in arms, with his brother, the Archbishop of Lyons, besieging Turin, to release the head of his house, the Count of Savoy, whom his subjects had deposed and imprisoned for his intolerable tyranny. The wealth of the Churches of Canterbury and Lyons was showered, but showered in vain, on their bandit army. Turin resisted the secular, more obstinately than London the spiritual arms of the Primate. He returned, not without disgrace to England. With such a Primate the Pope was not likely to find much vigorous or rightful opposition from the Church of England.¹

Pope Alexander IV., while he thus tyrannized in England, was not safe in Rome, or even in Anagni. The stern justice of the Senator Brancalone had provoked resistance, no doubt not discouraged by the partisans of the Pope. The Nobles urged on an insurrection : Brancalone was

The Senator
Brancalone
See vol. v.
p. 512.

¹ Paris, sub ann. 1241-4, 1250, 1256. See the letter from Pope Alexander, consolatory on the failure before Turin. Godwin de Præsulibus contains a full abstract of the life of Boniface. Compare MS., B. M. vi. p. 347, for the resistance and excommunication (the sentence) of the Dean of St. Paul's: also of Sub-Prior of St. Bartholomew: excommunication of Bishop of London, p. 383. The Archbishop had obtained, under grant of first-fruits, "*magnam quantitatem pecuniæ*," vii. 16. Papal decree against Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, p. 57. Archbishop Boniface was exempted from visiting his four Welsh dioceses, "*propter guerrarum discrimina. penuriam vietualium*," b. viii.

seized and thrown into prison. But his wise precaution had secured thirty hostages of the highest Roman patrician houses at Bologna. His wife fled to that city, and roused Bologna with harangues on the injustice and ingratitude shown to her great citizen. The hostages were kept guarded with stricter vigilance. The Nobles appealed to the Pope, who issued an angry mandate to the Bolognese, which they treated with scorn. The populace of Rome arose and broke the prison of Brancalcione. Brancalcione laid down his senatorship for two years (during which it was filled by a citizen of Brescia, who trod in his footsteps) to resume it with still more inflexible determination. On his reinauguration he summoned all malefactors before his tribunal, not the last the authors of his imprisonment. His sentence was inexorable by prayer or bribe. Men of the highest birth, even relatives of the Pope, were shown on gibbets. Two of the Annibaldi suffered this ignoble doom. He destroyed a hundred and forty castles of those lofty and titled spoilers. The Pope, at Viterbo, was so unadvised as to issue a sentence of excommunication against the Senator and the people of Rome. They were not content with treating this sentence with the bitterest derision. The Senator summoned the whole people to assemble, as one man, in arms; they marched under their banner towards Anagni, the birthplace of the Pope. The inhabitants of Anagni, many of them his kindred, implored Alexander with passionate entreaties to avert their doom. The Pope, to elude the disgrace of seeing his native city razed to the earth, was content to send deputies to Brancalcione, humbly imploring his mercy. The Senator had great difficulty in restraining the people. An

alliance grew up between Manfred and Brancalone. The Senator retained his dignity till his death: his head was then deposited in a coffer, like a precious relic, and placed with all the pomp of a religious ceremony, by the grateful people, on the top of a marble column. Notwithstanding the prohibition of the Pope, the people raised the uncle of Brancalone to the Senatorship of Rome.¹

Alexander could look for no aid from the Empire. The Papal Emperor, William of Holland, had fallen in an expedition against the Frisians. Death of William of Holland. Jan. 25, 1256. There was no great German Prince to command the Empire. The Pope, faithful to the legacy of hatred to the house of Swabia, contented himself with prohibiting in the strongest terms the election of the young Conradin. The Germans looked abroad; some of the divided Electors offered the throne again to Richard of Cornwall, others to Alfonso January, 1257. King of Castile. The enormous wealth of Richard of Cornwall, perhaps his feeble character, attracted the ambitious Archbishop of Cologne, who hoped in his name to rule the Empire, and to dispense the wealth of England. Richard was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle. March 17. Richard of Cornwall. He had before declined the kingdom of Naples; his avarice had resisted all the attempts of the King his brother and of the Pope to employ his riches in the cause of young Edmund; he retained them to gratify his own vanity.²

For seventeen years the Empire was in fact vacant; better for the Pope such anarchy than a Swabian on the throne. Rudolph of Hapsburg, A.D. 1273.

¹ Paris, sub ann. 1258.

² Paris says that, independent of the Empire, his revenues would have produced 100 marks a day for ten years.

France, so long as the treaty existed between the Pope and England for the investiture of Prince Edmund with the throne of Sicily, could be roused by no adequate temptation. The Pope could offer no vigorous resistance, yet would not make a virtue of necessity and acknowledge the house of Swabia. He had now fully discovered the weakness, the impotence of the King of England.¹ He had summoned him to execute his contract. Henry truly, but without shame, pleaded his poverty, and demanded a tenth of the ecclesiastical revenues. The excommunication hung over the head of the King for having made a bargain with the Pope which he could not fulfil.

Manfred had won the crown of Sicily in the name of his nephew Conradin; he was but Regent of the realm. Rumors were spread of the death of Conradin; the enemies of Manfred asserted that they were invented and disseminated by his astute ambition; his partisans that he had no concern in their propagation.² But Manfred was necessary to the power, to the independence of the Sicilies. The Prelates, Barons, almost the whole realm entreated him to assume the crown. His coronation took place to the universal joy. Hardly was it over when ambassadors arrived from the mother of Conradin, and from her son, imploring Manfred not to usurp the rights which he had defended with so much valor. Manfred received the ambassadors in a great assemblage of his Barons. "He had ascended the throne, which he had himself

¹ "Videns ipsius debilitatem ac impotentiam quam publice allegabat." — MS., B. M. In a letter, b. viii. p. 49, the Pope recites all the acts of Innocent IV., and the dates.

² Jamsilla. Recordano, c. 147. Le credo io favole. Murat. Ann., sub ann. 1258.

won by his arms, at the call of his people; their affections could alone maintain that throne. It was neither for the interest of the realm nor of Conradin himself that Naples should be ruled by a woman and an infant: he had no relative but Conradin, for whom he should preserve the crown, and faithfully bequeath it on his death. If Conradin desired to uphold the privileges of an heir-apparent, he should reside at the court of Manfred, and win the love of the people whom he was to govern. Manfred would treat him as a son, and instruct him in the virtues of his glorious ancestors." How far Manfred was sincere, Manfred himself perhaps did not know; how far, if he had himself issue, his virtue would have resisted the fondness of a parent for his own offspring, and that which he might have alleged to himself and to others as an undeniable truth, the interest of the kingdom. What confusion, what bloodshed might have been spared to Naples, to Italy, to Christendom, if the crown of Naples had descended in the line of Manfred; if the German connection had been broken forever, the French connection never formed; if Conradin had remained Duke of Swabia, and Charles of Anjou had not descended the Alps! A wiser Pope, and one less wedded to the hereditary policy and to the antipathies of his spiritual forefathers, might have discerned this, and seen how well it would have coincided with the interests of the see. Manfred acknowledged and fairly treated might have softened into a loyal Guelf; he was now compelled to be the head, a most formidable head, of the Ghibellines. Alexander lived to see Manfred in close alliance with Sienna, the stronghold of the exiled Ghibellines of Florence;¹ to see the

¹ See throughout Muratori, who quotes impartially Guelfs and Ghibellines.

fatal battle of Arba, or Monte Aperto, in which the Sept. 4, 1260. Florentine Guelfs were utterly crushed and forced to abandon their city. Florence was only saved from being razed to the earth at the instigation of the rival cities, Pisa and Sienna, by the patriotic appeal of the great Ghibelline, Farinata di Uberti, a name which lives in Dante's poetry.¹ In all the south of Italy Manfred was supreme: Genoa and Venice were his allies.

Nor was it the Guelfic or Papal influence, nor even his own unspeakable cruelties; it was his treachery to his friends alone that in the north of Italy caused the fall of the triumphant champion of the Ghibellines, Eccelin da Romano, and with him of his brother Alberic. The character of Eccelin was the object of the profoundest terror and abhorrence. No human suffering, it might seem, could glut his revenge; the enemy who fell into his hands might rejoice in immediate decapitation or hanging. The starvation of whole cities; the imprisonment of men, women, and children in loathsome dungeons touched not his heart, which seemed to have made cruelty a kind of voluptuous excitement.² But what was the social state of this part of Christendom? How had that state been aggravated by the unmitigated dissensions and wars, the feuds of city with city, the intestine feuds within every city! Had the voice of the Father of Christendom, of the Vicegerent of the Prince of Peace ever been earnestly raised in protest or rebuke? Was not the

¹ Inferno, vi. 79, x. 32.

² It may be doubted whether Eccelin himself was not gradually trained to this habit of barbarity. Frederick II., though severe and merciless to his foes, would hardly have addressed sportive letters, or given his daughter in marriage to a wild beast, such a wild beast as Eccelin appears in his later days.

Papal Legate the head of the Guelfic faction, and were the Guelfs on the whole more humane than the Ghibellines? Alexander might have published a crusade against this foe of the human race, and justly might he have offered more splendid promises of pardon and eternal life to him who should rid the world of this monster, than to him who should slay hosts of Moslem.¹ But a fitter, as an abler leader, might have been found for this enterprise than the Arch-^{Sept. 27, 1259.}bishop of Ravenna; and when the army of the Archbishop got possession of Padua, the ruthless sacking of the town by his mercenary soldiers made the citizens look back with regret to the iron rule of Eccelin. Nor would Papal anathema or Papal crusade have shaken the power of Eccelin.² With the Marquis Pallavicini and Buoso da Doara, the head of the Cremonese Ghibellines, he had become master of Brescia; but Eccelin never conquered save for himself. The flagrant treachery by which he had determined to rid himself of his colleagues was discovered; the indignant Ghibellines made a league against the common enemy of mankind. Eccelin was defeated, sorely wounded, captured. His end was worthy of his life. On the first night of his imprisonment the bells of a neighboring chapel rang loudly, perhaps rejoicing at his bondage. He woke up in wrath: "Go, hew down that priest that makes such a din with his bells." "You forget," said his guard, "that you are in prison." He inquired where he was taken. "At Bassano." Like most strong minds of the day, Eccelin, who had faith in nothing else, had faith in divination. His astrologer had foretold that he

¹ Compare Alexandri Epist. ad Episcopos.

² Rolandini, Monach. Patavin. apud Muratori.

should die in Bassano. The priests and friars thronged around him, urging, threatening, imploring, that he would confess and repent of his sins. "I repent of nothing, but that I have not wreaked full vengeance on my foes; that I have badly conducted my army, and allowed myself to be duped and betrayed." He would take neither food nor medicine; but death was

slow: he tore the dressings from his wounds, and was found a corpse.¹ Alberic, his brother, once his deadly enemy, was now his ally. Eccelin wanted but one vice, passion for women, which might possibly have given some softness to his heart. No woman was safe from the less sanguinary Alberic. Alberic was besieged during the next year in the castle of San Zeno. All hope of succor was gone; with some remains of generosity he allowed his followers to buy their own free departure by the surrender of himself and his wife, six sons and two daughters. He was at first treated with every kind of mockery; then his six sons slain in his sight, torn in pieces, their limbs thrust in his face. His wife, his beautiful and innocent daughters had their lower garments cut off; in this state of nakedness, in the sight of the whole army, were bound to a stake and burned alive. Alberic's own flesh was torn from his body by pincers; he was then tied to the tail of a horse, and dragged to death.

What wonder that amid such deeds, whatever religion remained, as it ever must remain in the depths of the human heart, either took refuge beyond the pale of the Church, among the Cathari, who never were

¹ Throughout see Rolandin, xii. c. 13; Chron. Veron., S. R. T., v. viii.; and Muratori, Annali, sub annis 1259, 1260. The B. Museum Chronicle sums up, "nullus in ferocitate ei unquam fuit similis." — p. 245.

more numerous in the cities, especially of northern Italy, than in these days : or within the Church showed itself in wild epidemic madness ? Against the Cathari the Friars preached in vain ; the Inquisition in vain held its courts ; and executions for heresy added more horrors to these dire times.

It was at this period too that one of those extravagant outbursts of fanaticism, which constantly occurred during the middle ages, ^{The Flagellants.} relieved men's minds in some degree from the ordinary horrors and miseries. Who is surprised that mankind felt itself seized by a violent access of repentance, or that repentance disdained the usual form of discipline ?

The Flagellants seemed to rise almost simultaneously in different parts of Italy. They began in Perugia. The penitential frenzy seized Rome : it spread through every city, Guelf and Ghibelline, crossed the Alps, and invaded Germany and France. Flagellation had long been a holy and meritorious discipline ; it was now part of the monastic system ; it had obtained a kind of dignity and importance, as the last sign of subjection to the sacerdotal power, the last mark of penitence for sins against the Church.¹ Sovereign princes, as Raymond of Toulouse ; Kings, as Henry of England, had yielded their backs to the scourge. How entirely self-flagellation had become part of sanctity, appears from its being the religious luxury of Louis IX. Peter Damiani had taught it by precept and example.² Dom-

¹ The " *Historia Flagellantium* " is a brief but complete history of religious flagellations, first of legal floggings administered by authority, then of the origin and practice of self-flagellation.

² *Epistol. ad Clericos Florentin.*, v. 8.

inic, called the Cuirassier, had invented or popularized by his fame the usage of singing psalms to the accompaniment of self-scourging. It had come to have its stated value among works of penance.¹

The present outburst was not the effect of popular preaching, of the eloquence of one or more vehement and ardent men, working on the passions and the fears of a vast auditory. It seemed as if mankind, at least Italian mankind, was struck at once with a sudden paroxysm of remorse for the monstrous guilt of the age, which found vent in this wild but hallowed form of self-torture. All ranks, both sexes, all ages, were possessed with the madness — nobles, wealthy merchants, modest and delicate women, even children of five years old. They stripped themselves naked to the waist, covered their faces that they might not be known, and went two and two in solemn slow procession, with a cross and a banner before them, scourging themselves till the blood tracked their steps, and shrieking out their doleful psalms. They travelled from city to city. Whenever they entered a city, the contagion seized all predisposed minds. This was done by night as by day. Not only were the busy mart and the crowded street disturbed by these processions; in the dead midnight they were seen with their tapers or torches gleaming before them in their awful and shadowy grandeur, with the lashing sound of the scourge and the screaming chant. Thirty-three days and a half, the number of the years of the Lord's sad sojourn in this world of man, was the usual period for

¹ "Consequitur ergo ut qui viginti psalteria cum disciplinâ decantet, centum annorum penitentiam se peregissee confidat." — Vit. Dominic Loric., p. 85.

the penance of each. In the burning heat of summer, when the wintry roads were deep in snow, they still went on. Thousands, thousands, tens of thousands joined the ranks; till at length the madness wore itself out. Some princes and magistrates, finding that it was not sanctioned by the Roman See or by the authority of any great Saint, began to interpose: that which had been the object of general respect, became almost as rapidly the object of general contempt.¹

The Flagellant frenzy was a purely religious movement.² It had been preceded by about ten years by that of the Pastoureaux (the Shepherds) in Flanders and in France. This rising had something of the fierce resentment of an oppressed and down-trodden peasantry. But it was a democratic insurrection, not against the throne, but against the tyrannous nobles and tyrannous churchmen: it was among those lowest of the low whom the Friar Preachers and the followers of St. Francis had not reached, or had left for higher game. The new Mendicant Orders were denounced as rudely as the luxurious Cluniacs or haughty Cistercians. The Shepherds' first declaration of war was that "the good King Louis was left in bondage to the Mussulmans, through the criminal and traitorous remissness of the indolent and

¹ "Unde tepescere in brevi cepit res immoderate concepta." — Herm. Alt. There are two full descriptions of this singular movement: one by an Italian, the Monachus Patavinensis in Muratori, viii. 712; the other by a German, Hermannus Altaheimsis (Abbot of Nieder Altaisch), in Böhmer. Fontes, ii. p. 516. See too B. Museum Chronicle: he adds, "Verumtamen propter hoc multe paces inter discordantes facte fuerunt, et multa bona acta sunt." His account is curious. — p. 250.

² Affo, Storia di Parma, iii. p. 256, connects the Flagellants with the believers in the Abbot Joachim. (See forward.)

avaricious clergy." They, the peasants of France, had received the direct mission, a mission from the blessed Virgin herself, to rescue him from the hands of the Unbelievers. So sudden, so terrible was the insurrection, that it was as if the fire had burst out at one instant in remote parts of the land. It began The Master of Hungary. in Flanders; at its head was a mysterious personage, who bore the name of the Master of Hungary. He was an aged man with a long beard, pale emaciated face; he spoke Latin, French, and German with the same fluent persuasiveness; he preached without authority of Pope or Prelate; as he preached, he clasped a roll in his hands, which contained his instructions from the blessed Virgin. The Virgin had appeared to him, encircled by hosts of angels, and had given him his celestial commission to summon the poor Shepherds to the deliverance of the good King. Terror spread the strangest rumors of this awful personage. He was an apostate Cistercian monk; in his youth he had denied Jesus Christ; he had sucked in the pernicious practices of magic from the empoisoned wells of Toledo (among the Jews and Arabians of that city). He it was that in his youth had led the crusade of children, who had plunged, following his steps, by thousands into the sea; he had made a solemn covenant with the Soldan of Babylon to lead a countless multitude of Christians to certain bondage in the Holy Land, that they and their King being in his power, he might subdue Christendom. Since the days of Mohammed, in the judgment of wise men, no such dangerous scourge of mankind had arisen in the Church of Christ. His title, the Master of Hungary, might lead to the suspicion that he was a Bulgarian

Manichee, revenging on the haughty hierarchy the wrongs of his murdered brethren.¹

The eloquence and mysterious bearing of the Master of Hungary stirred the lowest depths of society. The Shepherds, the peasants left their flocks, their stalls, their fields, their ploughs; in vain friends, parents, wives remonstrated; they took no thought of sustenance. So, drawing men after him, "as the loadstone draws the iron," he marched through Flanders and Picardy. He entered Amiens at the head of thirty thousand men, was received as the Deliverer with festive rejoicings. He passed on to the Isle of France, gathering, as some fell off from weakness or weariness, the whole laboring population in his wake. The villages and fields were desolate behind them. They passed through the cities (not one dared to close the gates against them), they moved in battle array, brandishing clubs, pikes, axes, all the wild weapons they could seize. The Provosts, the Mayors bowed in defenceless panic before them. They had at first only the standard of their Master, a Lamb bearing the banner of the Cross, the Lamb the sign of humility, the Cross that of victory.

Soon four hundred banners waved above them; on some were emblazoned the Virgin and the angels appearing to the Master. Before they reached Paris they were one hundred thousand and more. They had been joined by all the outlaws, the robbers, the excommunicate, followers more dangerous, as wielding and accustomed to wield arms, the two-edged axe, the sword, the dagger, and the pike. They had become an army. They seemed worshippers, it was said, of Mary rather

¹ Matt. Paris, sub ann.

than of Christ. Blanche, the Queen-Regent, either in panic or in some wild hope that these fierce hordes might themselves aid in achieving, or compel others to achieve the deliverance of her son, professed to believe their loyal protestations; they were admitted into Paris.

But already they had begun to show their implacable hostility to the Church. They usurped the offices of the clergy, performed marriages, distributed crosses, offered absolution to those who joined their Crusade. They taunted the Friar Preachers and Minorites as vagabonds and hypocrites; the White Monks (the Cistercians) with their covetousness, their vast possessions in lands and flocks; the Black Monks (the Benedictines) with gluttony and pride; the Canons, as worldly, self-indulgent men; Bishops, as hunters and hawkers, as given to all voluptuousness. No one dared to repeat the impious reproaches which they heaped on the Church of Rome.

All this the people heard with the utmost delight. It was rumored that the Master miraculously fed the multitudes; bread, meat, and wine multiplied under his hands. They had entered Paris: the Master was admitted into the presence of the Queen, and was received with honor and with gifts. The Master, emboldened, mounted the pulpit in the church of St. Eustache, with an episcopal mitre on his head, preached and blessed the holy water. Meantime, his followers swarmed in the neighboring streets, mercilessly slew the priests who endeavored to oppose their fierce fanaticism: the approaches to the University were closed, lest there should be a general massacre of the scholars.

The enormous host divided at Paris into three. One horde went towards Orleans and Bourges, Division of the host. one towards Bordeaux, one to the sea-coast At Orleans. at Marseilles. But though Paris, the seat of all wisdom and of the government, had received them, the southern cities had more courage; or the strange illusion had begun to dissipate of itself. The Shepherds entered Orleans, notwithstanding the resistance of the Bishop and the clergy; the citizens hailed their approach; the people crowded in countless numbers and rapt admiration around the Preacher. The Bishop issued his inhibition to all clerks, ordering them to keep aloof from the profane assembly: the wiser and older obeyed; some of the younger scholars were led by curiosity to hear one who preached unlicensed by Prelate, and who by his preaching had awed Paris and her famous University. The Master was in the pulpit; he was pouring forth his monstrous tenets: a scholar rushed forward, "Wicked heretic! foe to truth; thou liest in thy throat; thou deceivest the innocent with thy false and treacherous speech." He had hardly uttered these words, when his skull was cloven by one of the Master's followers. The scholars were pursued; the gates of the University broken in; a frightful butchery followed; their books were thrown into the Loire. By another account, the scholars made a gallant resistance. The Bishop, who had been forced to fly, left the city under an interdict, as having entertained these precursors of Antichrist. The complaints of the Bishop reached the ears of Queen Blanche. Her calm wisdom had returned. "I thought," she said, "that these people might recover the Holy Land

in simplicity and sanctity ; since they are impostors, be they excommunicated, scattered, destroyed."

They entered Bourges: notwithstanding the denunciations of the Archbishop, the city had opened her gates. Here the first act of the Master of Hungary was to penetrate into the Jews' quarter, to plunder their houses, and burn their books. But in Bourges he was so rash, or so intoxicated with success, as not to content himself with the wonders of his eloquence: after the sermon he promised, or was said to have promised, to work the most amazing miracles. The people, eager for the miracles, were perhaps less wrought upon by the sermon: they waited in breathless expectation, but they waited in vain. At that moment of doubt and disappointment, a man (he is called an executioner) rushed forth, and clove the head of the Master with a two-edged axe; his brains were scattered on the pavement; his soul, as all then believed, went direct to hell. The Royal Bailiff of Bourges was at hand with his men-at-arms; he fell on the panic-stricken followers, cast the body into the common sewer to be torn by hounds. The excommunication was read; the whole host were pursued and massacred like mad dogs.

The second squadron met no better fate; Simon de Bordeaux. Montfort closed the gates of Bordeaux against them, and threatened to sally out with his knights and behead them all. Their leader, the favorite companion of the Master of Hungary, was seized, bound hand and foot, and thrown into the Garonne; the scattered followers were seized, hanged; a few found their way home as wretched beggars. Some of these, and part

of the third division, reached Marseilles ; but the hallucination was over ; they were easily dispersed, Marseilles. most perished miserably. So suddenly began, so almost as suddenly ended this religious Jacquerie.¹

The pontificates of Innocent IV. and of Alexander IV., besides these great insurrections of one order of society — the very lowest against all above them — beheld the growth of a less tumultuous but more lasting and obstinate civil war within the Church itself. The Mendicant Friars, from the humble and zealous assistants, the active itinerant subsidiary force of the hierarchy, rapidly aspired to be their rivals, their superiors — at least equal sharers, not only in their influence and their power, but also in their wealth and pomp ; as far, at least, as in their buildings, their churches, their cloisters. They were no longer only among the poorest, the most ignorant of mankind : they were in the lordly halls of the nobles, in the palaces of kings. St. Louis, as we have heard, held them in such devout reverence, that if he could have divided his body, he would have given one half to either saint, Dominic or Francis.

Not only the Popes, the more religious of the hierarchy and of the old monastic orders, had hailed, welcomed, held in honor these new laborers, who took the hard and menial work in the lowly and neglected and despised part of the vineyard. The Popes had the wisdom to discern at once the power of this vast, silent, untraceable agency on the spiritual improvement of Christendom ; its power, not only against vice, ignorance, irreligion, but against those who dared, in their

¹ I have chiefly followed Matt. Paris and William of Nangis, with some few facts from other chronicles.

independence of thought, to rebel at the doctrines — in the pride of temporal authority to contest the all-embracing supremacy of the See of Rome. We have seen them during the whole war with Frederick II. the demagogues of refractory subjects, the publishers and propagators of the fulminations of the Popes in all lands, the levellers of mankind before the Papal autocracy, the martyrs of the high Papal faith. Those of less worldly views saw them only as employed in their holier work. Conrad of Zahringen, the General of the Cistercian Order, when they established their first house at Paris, vowed brotherhood with the Friar Preachers. When Legate at Cologne, a priest complained that the Preachers interfered in his parish. “How many parishioners have you?” “Nine thousand.” The Legate signed himself with the sign of the Cross: “Miserable man! presumest thou to complain, charged with so many souls, that these holy men would relieve you from part of your burden?”¹ Yet Conrad issued his mandate, that though the Friars might preach and administer the sacrament of penance, they should refuse it to all who withdrew themselves from the care of their legitimate pastor. Robert Gros-tête of Lincoln, as has been said, maintained them against his own negligent or luxurious clergy.

But their zeal or their ambition was not yet satisfied.

The Uni-
versities. They aspired to the chief seats of learning; they would rule the Universities, now rising to their height of fame and authority. Of all the uni-
Paris. versities beyond the Alps, Paris was then the most renowned. If Bologna might boast her civil

¹ Ann. Cistercien. quoted in Hist. Littér. de la France, article “Conrad of Zahringen.”

lawyers, Salerno her physicians, Paris might vie with these great schools in their peculiar studies, and in herself concentrated the fame of all, especially of the highest—theology. The University of Paris had its inviolable privileges, its own endowments, government, laws, magistrates, jurisdiction; it was a state within a state, a city within a city, a church within a church. It refused to admit within its walls the sergeants of the Mayor of Paris, the apparitors of the Bishop of Paris; it opened its gates sullenly and reluctantly to the King's officers. The Mendicants (the Dominicans and Franciscans) would teach the teachers of the world; they would occupy not only the pulpits in the churches, and spread their doctrines in streets and market-places, they would lay down the laws of philosophy, theology, perhaps of canonical jurisprudence, from the chairs of professors; and they would vindicate their hardy aspirations by equalling, surpassing the most famous of the University. Already the Dominicans might put forward their Albert the Great, the nearest approach to a philosopher; the Franciscans, the Englishman Alexander Hales, the subtlest of the new race of schoolmen. Aquinas and Bonaventura were to come. The jealous University, instead of receiving these great men as allies with open arms, rejected them as usurpers.¹

But the University was in implacable war with the authorities of Paris; there was a perpetual feud, as in

¹ Tillemont indeed says, "*L'Université les receut même avec joie dans ses écoles, parceque leur vie paroissoit alors édifiante et utile au public, et qu'ils sembloient s'appliquer aux sciences avec autant d'humilité que d'ardeur et de succès. Mais elle éprouva bientôt qu'il est dangereux de donner entrée à des personnes trop puissantes, et de se lier avec ceux qui ont des desseins et des intérêts différens.*" See the laborious essay on Guillaume de St. Amour, *Vie de Louis IX.*, p. 133 *et seq.*

other universities, between the town and the gown. However wild and unruly the youth, the University would maintain her prerogative of sole and exclusive jurisdiction over them. The sober citizens would not endure the riot, and worse than riot, of these profligate boys.¹ Their insolent corporate spirit did not respect the Cardinal Legate.² On one occasion (in 1228), in a fierce fray of many days, two scholars were killed by the city guard. The University haughtily demanded satisfaction; on the refusal closed her gates, suspended her lectures, at first maintained sullen silence, and then, at least a large portion of the scholars shook the dust from their feet, deserted the dark and ungrateful city, and migrated to Rheims, Orleans, Angers, even to Toulouse.³ The Dominicans seized their opportunity; they obtained full license for a chair of theology from the Bishop of Paris and the Chancellor. On the return of the University to Paris, they found these powerful rivals in possession of a large share in the theologic instruction. Their reestablishment, resisted by the Crown and by the Bishop of Paris (the Crown indignant that the University had presumed to confer degrees at Orleans and at Angers, the Bishop jealous of their exemption from his jurisdiction), was only effected by the authority of Pope Gregory IX. The Pontiff was anxious that Paris, the foundation of all sound learning, should regain her distinction. His mild and

¹ The scholars were forbidden to bear arms in 1218. The Official of Paris complains "*qu'ils enfonçoient et brisoient les portes des maisons; qu'ils enlevoient les filles et les femmes.*" — Crevier, i. p. 334.

² Crevier, p. 335. The dispute was about the University seal.

³ Crevier, 341. The reader who requires more full, learned, and prolix information, will consult Du Boulay, *Hist. Univers. Paris*. Crevier's is a clear, rapid, and skilful epitome of Du Boulay.

conciliatory counsels prevailed : the University resumed her station, and even obtained the valuable privilege that the Rector and Scholars were not liable to any excommunication not directly sanctioned by the Holy See.

Above twenty years of treacherous peace followed. The Mendicants were gaining in power, fame, influence, unpopularity. They encroached more and more on the offices, on the privi-

1231-1252.
Dispute with
the Domin-
icans.

leges of the clergy ; stood more aloof from episcopal jurisdiction ; had become, instead of the clergy and the older monasteries, the universal legatees ; obscured the University by the renown of their great teachers. The university raised a loud outcry that there were twelve chairs of theology at Paris : of these, five out of the six colleges of the Regulars — the Cistercians, Premonstratensians, Val de Grace, Trinitarians, Franciscans — held each one, the Dominicans two ; the Canons of Paris occupied three ; there remained but two for the whole Secular Clergy.¹ They issued their edict suppressing one of the Dominicans : the Dominicans laughed them to scorn. The quarrel was aggravated by the refusal of the Dominican and Franciscan Professors to join the rest of the University in demanding justice for the death of a scholar slain in a fray.² The University passed a sentence of expulsion against the Dominican Professors. The Dominicans appealed to the Pope. They obtained, it was averred by false representations, a favorable award. Europe rang with the clamorous remonstrances of the University of Paris.

¹ Crevier, p. 396.

² The University obtained justice ; two men were hanged for the offence.
— Crevier ; p. 400.

They issued an address to the whole Episcopate of Christendom. "Would the Bishops, very many of whom had studied at Paris, allow that famous University, the foundation of the faith, to be shaken?"¹ They pressed their appeal before Pope Innocent IV. Innocent, a great student of the canon law, had always looked on the University of Paris with favor. The Mendicants had done their work; Frederick II. was dead; Innocent master of Italy. The Pope, who had alienated the University by his exactions and arrogance, endeavored to propitiate them by the sacrifice of his faithful allies the Friars. He promulgated his celebrated bull, subjugating the Mendicant Orders to episcopal authority. The next month Pope Innocent was dead. The Dominicans revenged themselves on the ungrateful Pontiff by assuming the merit of his death, granted to their prayers. "From the Litanies of the Dominicans, good Lord deliver us," became a proverbial saying.²

Bull of Pope
Innocent.

Nov. 1254.

Alexander IV. was not the protector only, he was the humble slave of the Mendicants.³ His first act was to annul the bull of his predecessor without reservation.⁴ The Mendicants were at once reinstated in all their power. In vain the eloquent William (called St. Amour, from

Alexander
IV.

William of
St. Amour.

¹ "Si on attaque le fondement (de l'Eglise) qui est l'Ecole de Paris, tout l'édifice est mis en péril." — See Crevier, p. 407.

"Et se ne fust la bonne garde
De l'Université, qui garde
Le chief de la Chrétienté."

Roman de la Rose, l. 12415.

² Antonini. Senens. in *Chronic. Compare Hist. Lit. de la France*, xix. p. 197, article William de St. Amour.

³ The words of Crevier, p. 411.

⁴ He was elected Dec. 12; revoked the bull Dec. 22.

the place of his birth in Franche Comté) maintained the privileges of the University: he returned discomfited, not defeated, to Paris. He was hailed as the acknowledged champion of the University, and devoted himself with dauntless courage and perseverance to the cause.¹ He not only asserted the privileges of the University; Paris rung with his denunciations of the Mendicants, of Mendicancy itself. He preached with a popularity rivalling or surpassing the best preachers of the Orders. He accused the Friars as going about into houses, leading astray silly women, laden with sins, usurping everywhere the rule over their consciences and men's property, aspiring to tyrannize over public opinion. "And who were they? No successors of the Apostles; they presumed to act in the Church with no spiritual lineage, with no tradition of authority; from them arose the 'Perils of the days to come.'"²

The Dominicans had boasted, according to the popular poet,³ that they ruled supreme in Paris and in

¹ To William of St. Amour was attributed the bull of Innocent IV.

"S'il n'avait en sa verité
L'accord de l'Université,
Et du peuple communement
Qui oyoyent son prêchement."

Roman de la Rose, l. 12113.

² *Opera Gulielm. St. Amour*, Præf. p. 23.

³ "Li Jacobin (Dominicains) sont si pseudoume.

Qu'il ont Paris et si ont Roume,
Et si sont roi et Apostole
Et de l'avoir ont il grant soume.
Et qui se meurt, se il ne's nomme
Pour executeurs, s'âme afole,
Et sont apostre par parole.

* * * *

Lor haine n'est pas frivole,
Je, qui redout ma tête fole
Ne vous di plus mais qu'il sont home."

Rutebeuf. edit. Jubinal, i. 161.

Rome: they had lost Paris, but in Rome they ruled without rival. The first, the most famous, it is said, of forty bulls issued by Alexander IV., appeared during the next year.¹ It commenced with specious adulation of the University, ended with awarding complete victory to the Dominicans. While it seemed to give full power to the University, it absolutely annulled their statute of exclusion against the Dominicans. The Bishops of Orleans and Auxerre were charged with the execution of this bull; they were armed with ample powers of spiritual censure, of excommunicating, or suspending from their office all masters or scholars guilty of contumacy. The University defied or attempted to elude these censures. They obstinately refused to admit the Dominicans to their republic; they determined rather to dissolve the University; many masters and students withdrew, some returned and took up again their attitude of defiance. William de St. Amour was the special object of the hatred of the Mendicants. He was arraigned before the Bishop of Paris, at the suit of Gregory, a chaplain of Paris, as having disseminated a libel defamatory of the Pope. St. Amour appeared; but the courage of the accuser had failed, he was not to be found. St. Amour offered canonical purgation; to swear on the relics of the Holy Martyrs that he was guiltless of the alleged crime. Four thousand scholars stood forward as his compurgators. The Bishop was forced to dismiss the charge.² In vain the four great Archbishops of France interfered

¹ This bull was called "*Quasi lignum vitæ*." The successive bulls may be read in the Bullarium.

² Crevier, from a letter of the students of the University to the Pope. It was possibly before the arrival of the bull.

to allay the strife ; the pulpits rung with mutual criminations.

William of St. Amour and his zealous partisans arraigned the Mendicants, not merely as usurpers of the rights, offices, emoluments of the clergy, of heredipety and rapacity utterly at variance with their ostentatious poverty, but both orders, indiscriminately Dominicans as well as Franciscans, as believers in, as preachers and propagators of the *Everlasting Gospel*. This book, which became the manual, I had almost said the Bible of the spiritual Franciscans, must await its full examination till those men — the Fraticelli — come before us in their formidable numbers and no less formidable activity. Suffice it here, that the *Everlasting Gospel*, the prophetic book ascribed to the Abbot Joachim, or rather the introduction to ^{The Eternal Gospel.} the *Everlasting Gospel*, proclaimed the approach, the commencement of the Last Age of the World, that of the Holy Ghost. The Age of the Father — that of the Law — had long since gone by ; that of the Son was ebbing on its last sands ; and with the Age of the Son, the Church, the hierarchy, its power, wealth, splendor, were to pass away. The Age of the Holy Ghost was at hand, it was in its dawn. The Holy Ghost would renew the world in the poverty, humility, Christian perfection of St. Francis. The *Everlasting Gospel* superseded and rendered useless the other four. It suited the enemies of the Mendicants to involve both Orders in this odious charge : the Introduction to the *Everlasting Gospel* was by some attributed to the Dominicans, its character, its spirit, its tone, were unquestionably Franciscan.¹

¹ Matt. Paris (sub ann 1256), Richer. Cronic. Senens., and the authors

These two rival Orders had followed in their development the opposite character of their founders. To the stern, sober, practical views of Dominic had succeeded stern, sober, practical Generals. The mild, mystic, passionate Francis was followed by men all earnest and vehement, but dragged different ways by conflicting passions: the passion for poverty, as the consummation and perfection of all religion; the passion for other ends to which poverty was but the means, and therefore must be followed out with less rigor. The first General, Elias, even in the lifetime of the Saint, tampered with the vow of holy poverty; he was deposed, as we have heard, became no longer the partisan of the Pope, but of Frederick II., was hardly permitted on his death-bed to resume the dress of the Order.¹ It may be presumed that Crescentius, the sixth General, was, from age or temper, less rigorous as to this vital law. He, too, was deposed from his high place, and John of Parma became General of the Order. John of Parma² was, it might be said (if St. Francis him-

of the Roman de la Rose, attribute the Everlasting Gospel to the Dominicans. Such was the tone in Paris. According, however, to the Roman de la Rose, it had another author: —

“ Ung livre de par le grant Diable,
Dit l'Evangile pardurable,
Que le Saint Esperit ministre,
Bien est digne d'être brulé.

* * * *

Tant surmonte ceste Evangile,
Ceux que les quatre Evangelistes
Jesu-Christ firent a leurs tiltres.”

— L. 12444, &c.

It appeared, according to the poet William de Lorris, in 1250: it was in the hands of every man and woman in the “ parvis Nôtre Dame.”

¹ Chroniques des Frères Mineurs, c. xlii. p. 27.

² The best account which I have read of John of Parma is in the *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, t. xx. p. 23. But the whole of this development of spiritual Franciscanism will be more fully traced hereafter.

self was not the parent of the Spiritualist Franciscans), that parent; he was the extremest of the extreme. His first act was a visitation of all the monasteries of the Order, the enforcement of that indispensable virtue which would brook no infringement whatever. John of Parma was employed by Innocent IV. in Greece, in an endeavor to reconcile the Oriental schism. In 1251 he was again in Rome. In 1256, exactly the very year in which came forth the daring book of William de St. Amour, there were strange rumors, sullen suppressed murmurs against John of Parma. He was deposed, and only by the influence of the Cardinal Ottobuoni permitted to dwell in retirement at Reate. There seems but slight doubt that he was deposed as the author of the Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel.¹ It needed all the commanding gentleness, the unrivalled learning, the depth of piety, in St. Bonaventura, the new General, to allay the civil feud, and delay for some years the fatal schism among the followers of St. Francis—the revolt of the Spiritualists from the Order.

The war continued to rage in Paris, notwithstanding a short truce brought about by the King and the Bishops. Bull after bull arrived.² Pope Alexander appealed at length to the King; he demanded of the secular power the exile of the obstinate leaders of the Anti-Mendicant party, William de St. Amour, Eudes of Douai, Nicolas Dean of Bar-sur-Aube, and Chris-

¹ It was the great object of Wadding and of Staraglia to release the memory of a General of their order from the authorship of an heretical book. It is attributed to him, or to Gerard di Borgo san Donnino, under his auspices, by Nicolas Eymeric. Direct. Inquis. ii. v. 24. Bzovius. sub ann. 1250. Bulæus, p. 299. See also Tillemont's impartial summing up, p. 157.

² Tillemont, p. 182.

tian Canon of Beauvais.¹ Before the King (St. Louis), whose awful reverence and passionate attachment to the Mendicant Orders were well known, had determined on his course, William of St. Amour had published his terrible book on the "Perils of the Last Times." This book, written in the name, perhaps with the aid and concurrence of the theologians of the University, was more dangerous, because it denounced not openly the practices of the Friars, but it was a relentless, covert, galling exposure of them and of their proceedings. That they were meant as the forerunners of Antichrist, the irrefragable signs of the "perils of the last times," none could doubt. The book was sent by the indignant King himself to Rome. The University had endeavored in vain to anticipate the more rapid movements of their adversary. They had despatched a mission (the very four men condemned by the Pope) to Rome, bearing the Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel, and demanding the condemnation of that flagrantly heretical book.² They had obtained letters of recommendation from all the chapters in the province of Rheims.

Ere they arrived, the all-powerful Dominicans had struck their blow. The "Perils of the Last Times" had been submitted to the examination of four Cardinals, one of them a Dominican — Hugo de St. Cher, who sat as judge in his own cause. It was condemned as unjust, wicked, execrable; it was burned in the presence of the Pope, before the Cathedral at Anagni.

¹ On these men compare Tillemont, p. 144. Thomas Canteprat, among later writers the great enemy of William de St. Amour, admits that he seduced the clergy and people of Rome by his eloquence.

² The Introduction had been before or was now formally condemned at Rome.

William de St. Amour stood alone in Rome against the Pope Alexander, the Cardinals, and the Dominicans, headed by Hugo de St. Cher.¹ Exile of William of St. Amour. He conducted his defence with consummate courage and no less consummate address. It was impossible to fix upon him the fatal guilt of heresy.² His health began to fail; he was prohibited for a time from returning to France, perhaps was not sorry to obey the prohibition. He does not seem even to have been deprived of his benefices.³ His quiet place of exile was his native St. Amour, in Franche Comté, not yet in the dominions of France. He was followed by the respect and fond attachment of the whole University.

But it is singular that William of St. Amour was not only the champion of the learned University, he was the hero of Parisian vulgar poetry.⁴ Popular party. Notwithstanding that the King, and that King St. Louis, espoused the cause of the Mendicants, the people were on the other side. The popular Preachers, and the popular ministers, who had sprung from the people, spoke the language, expressed at the same time and excited the sympathies and the religious passions of the lowest of the low, had ceased to be popular. They had been even outpreached by William of St. Amour. The Book of the Perils of the Last Times was disseminated in the vulgar tongue. The author of the romance of the Rose,⁴ above all, Rutebeuf, in

¹ On Hugo de St. Cher, Tillemont, p. 15.

² It was condemned "non propter hæresim quam continebat sed quia contra præfatos religiosos seditionem et scandala concitabat." — G. Nangis.

³ Tillemont, p. 212.

⁴ "Si j'en devoye perdre la vie,
Ou estre mys contre droiture.
Comme Saint Pol, en chartre obscure,

his rude verse addressed to the vulgar of all orders, heaped scorn and hatred on the Mendicants.¹

The war between the University and the Dominicans continued, if in less active, in sullen Great schoolmen. obstinacy. They were still the rival powers, who would not coalesce, each striving to engross public education. Yet after all the Mendicants won a noble victory, not by the authority of the Pope, nor by the influence of the King, but by outshining the fame of the University through their own unrivalled teachers. On the death of Alexander IV., William of St. Amour returned to Paris; he was received with frantic rapture.² His later book,³ more cautious, yet not less

Ou estre banny du Royaulme,
A tort, comme fut Maistre Guillaume
De St. Amour, que ypocrisie
Fist exiller par grant envie."

Roman de la Rose, l. 12123.

Lorris talks of scorning "papelorderie." Paris writes, "Subsannavit populus, eleemosynas consuetas subtrahens, vocans eos hypocritas, antichristi successores (ante-cessores?) pseudo-prædicatores."

¹ See especially the two poems, de Maistre Guillaume de St. Amour, pp. 71 and 78, "or est en son pais reclus" — on St. Amour, p. 81.

"Ou a nul si vaillant homme,
Qui por l'apostoille de Romme,
Ne por le roi,
Ne veut desreer son error,
Ainz en a souffert le desror
De perdre honor?" — P. 85.

Compare also "La Bataille des Vices contre les Vertus" (ii. p. 65), "La Discorde de l'Université et les Jacobins," "Les Ordres de Paris," &c. &c., with constant reference to the notes. The curious reader will not content himself with the valuable edition of Rutebeuf by M. Jubinal; he will consult also the excellent article by M. Paullin Paris in the *Hist. Lit. de la France*, xx. p. 710. Rutebeuf reads to me like our Skelton; he has the same flowing rapid doggrel, the same satiric verse, with not much of poetry, but both are always alive.

² May 1261. "Debacchantibus summâ in lætitiâ omnibus Magistris Parisiensibus." — Du Boulay.

³ *Collectiones Catholicæ*.

hostile, was received with respect and approbation by Pope Clement IV.¹ Yet who could deny, who presume to question, the transcendent fame, the complete mastery of the Dominicans in theology, and that philosophy which in those days aspired not to be more than the humble handmaid of theology? (Albert the Great might, perhaps, have views of more free and independent science, and so far, of course, became a suspected magician.) Who could compete with their Doctors, Hugo de St. Cher, Albert the Great, Thomas of Aquino? The Franciscans, too, had boasted their Alexander Hales, they had now their Bonaventura: Duns Scotus, the rival of Aquinas, was speedily to come.² The University could not refuse to itself the honor of conferring its degrees on Aquinas,³ and on Bonaventura. And still the rivals in scholastic theology, who divided the world (the barren it might be,

¹ See on this book, and others, *Hist. Lit. de la France*, article St. Amour, t. xix. 197. To his earlier works belongs, not only the "De Periculis" (in his works and in *Fasciculus* of Brown, who translated it with some sermons), but also a book, *De Antichristo*, under the pseudonyme of Nicolas de Oresme. The object of this is to show the coming of Antichrist, of which the chief signs are the setting up the Everlasting Gospel against the true Gospels, and the multitudes of false preachers, false prophets, wandering and begging friars. — *Ibid.* See also account of the writings of Gerard of Abbeville, another powerful antagonist of the Mendicants.

² Those who esteemed themselves the genuine Franciscans, always sternly protested against the pride of learning, to which their false brethren aspired in the universities. Hear Jacopone da Todi:

"Tal è, qual è, tal è,
Non c'è religione
Mal vedemmo Parigi,
Che n'è destrutto Assisi.
Colla sua lettorìa
L'han messo in mala via."

³ Thomas Aquinas condescended to answer William of St. Amour. See *Adversus Impugnantes Religionem*.

and dreary intellectual world, yet in that age the only field for mental greatness), were the descendants of the representatives of the two Orders. The Scotists and the Thomists fought what was thought a glorious fight on the highest metaphysics of the Faith, till the absorbing question, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, arose to commit the two Orders in mortal and implacable antagonism.

The hatred of the Mendicants might seem to pass over to the secular clergy. In every part of Europe the hierarchy still opposed with dignity or with passion the encroachments of these fatal rivals. More than twenty years later met a National Council at Paris. Four Archbishops and twenty Bishops took their seats in a hall of the Episcopal Palace. The Masters, Doctors, Bachelors, and Students of the University, were summoned to hear the decrees of the Council. The heads of the other religious orders, not Mendicant, had their writs of convocation. Simon de Beaulieu, Archbishop of Bourges, took the lead. In a grave sermon, he declared that charity to their flocks demanded their interposition; their flocks, for whom they were bound to lay down their lives. He inveighed against the Dominicans and the Franciscans, who were sowing discord in every diocese, in every rank, preaching and hearing confessions without license from the Bishop and the curate. Their insolence must be repressed. He appealed to the University to join in an appeal to the Pope to define more rigidly their asserted privileges. William of Macon, Bishop of Amiens, the most learned jurist in France, followed: he explained the bull of Innocent IV., which prohibited the Friars from preaching, hearing confessions, imposing penance

Secular
clergy and
Mendicants.

without permission of the Bishop or lawful pastor. The whole clergy of France were ready to shed their blood in defence of their rights and duties.¹

¹ This is well related in the Hist. Lit. de la France, t. xxi. article Simon de Beaulieu.

CHAPTER III.

URBAN IV. CLEMENT IV. CHARLES OF ANJOU.

ALEXANDER IV. died an exile from Rome at Viterbo.
Death of Alexander IV. June 12, 1261. Either from indolence or irresolution, he had allowed the College of Cardinals to dwindle to the number of eight. These eight were of various nations and orders: two Bishops, Otho a Frenchman, Stephen an Hungarian; two Presbyters, John an English Cistercian, Hugo a Dominican from Savoy; four Deacons, Richard a Roman, and Octavian a Tuscan of noble birth, John another Roman, Otto-buoni a Genoese. There was no prevailing interest, no commanding name. More than three months passed in jealous dispute. The strife was fortuitously ended by the appearance of James Pantaleon, the Patriarch of Jerusalem. He was elevated by sudden acclamation to the Papal throne.

The Patriarch was a son of a cobbler at Troyes:¹ and it was a wonderful sight, as it were, a provocation to the first principles of Christianity, to behold in those days of feudal monarchy and feudal aristocracies a man of such base parentage in the highest dignity upon

¹ "Pauperculi veteramentarii calceamenta resarcientis" — S. Antonin. iii. xiv. p. 59 — big words to describe a cobbler. According to the Hist. Littér. (article Urban IV., t. xiv. p. 49), there is a tapestry at Troyes, in the Church of St. Urban, representing Pantaleon (the father) in his shop full of boots and shoes, and his mother spinning and watching little James.

earth. James had risen by regular steps up the ascent of ecclesiastical advancement, a Priest at Laon, a Canon at Lyons, Archdeacon of Liège, a Missionary Legate in Livonia, Pomerania, and Prussia,¹ a pilgrim and Patriarch of Jerusalem. Such a man could not so have risen without great abilities or virtues. But if the rank in which he was born was honorable, the place was inauspicious. Had the election not fallen on a Frenchman, Italy might perhaps have escaped the descent of Charles of Anjou, with its immediate crimes and cruelties; and the wars almost of centuries, which had their origin in that fatal event. Any Pope, indeed, must have had great courage to break through the traditional policy of his predecessors (where the whole power rests on tradition, a bold, if not a perilous act). Urban must have recanted the long-cherished hatred and jealousy of the house of Hohenstaufen; he must have clearly foreseen (himself a Frenchman) that the French dominion in Naples would be as fatal as the German to the independence of Italy and of the Church; that Charles of Anjou would soon become as dangerous a neighbor as Manfred.

Urban IV. took up his residence in Viterbo: already might appear his determined policy to renew the close alliance between the Papacy and his native France. The holy character of Louis, who by the death of Frederick and the abeyance of the Empire, by the wars of the Barons against Henry of England, had become the most powerful monarch in Christendom, gave further

¹ See in Voigt, *Geschichte Preussens*, ii. p. 591, his wise conduct as a mediator between the Teutonic Order, and Swartobol, Duke of Pomerania, the ally of the heathen Prussians.

preponderance to his French inclinations.¹ He filled up the College of Cardinals with fourteen new prelates, at least one half of whom were French.

The Empire still hung in suspense between the con-
The Empire. flicting claims of Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso of Castile : Urban, with dexterous skill, perpetuated the anarchy. By timely protestation, and by nicely balancing the hopes of both parties, that his adjudication, earnestly and submissively sought by both, would be in favor of each, he suppressed a growing determination to place the crown on the head of young Conradin. Against this scheme Urban raised his voice with all the energy of his predecessors, and dwelt with the same menacing censure on the hereditary and indelible crimes of the house of Swabia : he threatened excommunication on all who should revive the claims of that impious race. After a grave examination of the pretensions of Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso of Castile, he cited both parties to plead their cause before him, and still drew out, with still baffled expectations of a speedy sentence, the controversy which he had no design to close.

The Latin Empire of Constantinople had fallen : Baldwin II. sought refuge, and only found refuge in the West. The Greek Palæologi were on the throne of the East, and seemed not indisposed to negotiate on the religious question with the Pope. The Holy Land, the former diocese of Pope Urban, was in the most deplorable state : the Sultan of Babylon had risen again in irresistible power ; he had overrun the whole country ; the Christians were hardly safe in Ptolemaïs. In

¹ See in Raynaldus the verses of Theodoricus Vallicolor, sub ann. 1262, sub fine.

vain the Pope appealed to his own countrymen in behalf of his old beloved diocese ; the clergy Crusade fails. of France withheld their contributions, and whether from some jealousy of their lowly countryman, now so much above them ; or since the cause had so utterly failed even under their King, it might seem absolutely desperate, the Archbishops of Sens and of Bourges were unmoved by the Papal rebukes or remonstrances, and continued, at least not to encourage the zeal of their clergy.

The affairs of Italy and Naples threatened almost the personal safety of the Pope. Manfred Manfred. was at the height of his power ; he no longer deigned to make advances for reconciliation, which successive Popes seemed to treat with still stronger aversion. Everywhere Ghibellinism was in the ascendant. The Marquis Pallavicini and Buoso da Doara at the head of the Cremonese, maintained more than an equal balance in Lombardy. Pisa and Sienna, rampant after the fall of the Guelfic rule in Florence, received the letters of the Pope with civil contempt. It might appear that Manfred was admitted into the rank of the legitimate Sovereigns of Christendom. In vain the Pope denounced the wickedness, the impiety of a connection with an excommunicated family, the King of Arragon did not scruple to marry his son to the daughter of Manfred. The marriage of the son of Louis of France to the daughter of Arragon, increased the jealous alarm of the Pope. Even Louis did not permit the Papal remonstrances to interfere with these arrangements.

Miserable, in the mean time, was the state of Italy. Scarcely a city or territory from the confines ^{State of} Italy.

of Apulia to the Alps was undisturbed by one of those accursed feuds, either of nobles against the people, or of Guelfs against Ghibellines. Nowhere was rest. Now one party, now another must dislodge from their homes, and go into exile. Urban could not remain in Rome. The stronger cities were waging war on the weaker. All the labors of the Holy Inquisition and all the rigor of their penalties, instead of extirpating the heresy of the Paterins and various Manichean sects, might seem to promote their increase. In general, it was enough to be Ghibelline, and to oppose the Church, down came the excommunication; all sacred offices ceased. It may be well imagined how deeply all this grieved religious men, the triumph and joy of the heretics.¹

Only to France could the Pope, even if no Frenchman, have looked for succor if determined to maintain the unextinguished feud with Manfred. Already the crown of Naples had been offered to Charles of Anjou. Urban IV. first laid it at the feet of Louis himself, either for his brother or one of his sons. But the delicate conscience of Louis revolted from the usurpation of a crown, to which were already three claimants of right. If it was hereditary, it belonged to Conradin; if at the disposal of the Pope, it was already awarded, and had not been surrendered by Edmund of England; and Manfred was on the throne, summoned, it might seem, by the voice of the nation. Manfred's claim, as maintained by an irreligious alliance with the Saracens, and as the possession of a Christian throne by one accused of favoring the Saracens, might easily

¹ See this and much more to the same effect in Muratori, *Annal.* sub ann. 1263.

be dismissed ; but there was strong doubt as to the others. The Pope, who perhaps from the first had preferred the more active and enterprising Charles of Anjou, because he could not become King of France, in vain argued and took all the guilt on his own head :¹ “ the soul of Louis was as precious to the Pope and the cardinals as to himself.” Louis did not refuse his assent to the acceptance of the crown by his brother. It is said, that he was glad to rid his court, if not his realm, which he was endeavoring to subdue to monastic gravity, of his gayer brother, who was constantly summoning tournaments, was addicted to gaming, and every other knightly diversion.²

Charles of Anjou might seem designated for this service. Valiant, adventurous, with none of that punctilious religiousness which might seem to set itself above ecclesiastical guidance, yet with all outward respect for the doctrine and ceremonial of the Church ; with vast resources, holding, in right of his wife, the principality of Provence ; he was a leader whom all the knighthood of France, who were eager to find vent for their valor, and to escape the peaceful inactivity or dull control under which they were kept by the scrupulous justice of Louis IX., would follow with eager zeal. Charles had hardly yet shown that intense selfishness and cruelty which, in the ally, in the king chosen by the Pope for his vassal realm, could not but recoil upon the Pope himself. He had already indeed besieged and taken Marseilles, barbarously executed all the citizens who

¹ Epist. to Albert of Parma, the notary who was empowered to treat as to the conditions of the assumption of the throne of Naples. — Raynald., sub ann. 1262.

² “ Quies sui regni, quam perturbabat Carolus in torneamentis et aleis.” — Ptolom., Luc. c. xxv.

had defended the liberties of their town, and abrogated all the rights and privileges of that flourishing municipality. His ambitious wife, Beatrice of Provence, jealous of being the sister of three queens, herself no queen, urged her unreluctant husband to this promising enterprise. But the Pope had still much to do; there were disputes between the sisters, especially the Queen of France and the Countess of Provence, on certain rights as coheiresses of that land. Though the treaty was negotiated, drawn up, perhaps actually signed, it was not yet published. It was thought more safe and decent to obtain a formal abjuration of his title from Edmund of England.

Bartholomew Pignatelli, Archbishop of Cosenza, a
England.
A.D. 1263. Guelfic prelate of noble blood, received a commission as legate to demand the surrender of the crown of Sicily. He was afterwards to lay the result of his mission before Louis of France, in order to obtain his full consent to the investiture of Charles of Anjou. Henry III., threatened by the insurrection of his barons, might well be supposed wholly unable to assert the pretensions of his son to a foreign crown; yet he complained with some bitterness that the treasures of England, so long poured into the lap of the Pontiff, had met with such return.¹ Urban endeavored to allay his indignation by espousing his cause against the Earl of Leicester (Simon de Montfort) and the Barons of England: he absolutely annulled all their leagues.² William, Archdeacon of

¹ See despatch to Archbishop of Cosenza, MS., B. M., July 25. 1263, to the King, *ibid.* v. x. Instructions at full length, dated Orvieto, Oct. 4.

² "Conjuraciones omnes cassamus et irritamus. Ad fideles." — MS., B. M., 23d Aug. 1263.

Paris, the Pope's chaplain, had power to relieve Henry from all his constitutional oaths.¹ As the war became more imminent, more inevitable, both before and after the rejection of the award in favor of the King by the acknowledged arbiter, Louis IX., the Pope adhered with imperious fidelity to the King. Ugo Falcodi, Cardinal of St. Sabina, was sent as Legate, to command the vassal kingdom to peace: the rebellious subjects were to be ordered to submit to their sovereign, and abandon their audacious pretensions to liberty. The Legate was armed with the amplest power to prohibit the observation of all the statutes, though sworn to by the King, the Queen, and the prince; to suspend and depose all prelates or ecclesiastics; to deprive all counts, barons, or laymen, who held in fee estates of the Church, and to proceed at his discretion to any spiritual or temporal penalties.² He had power to provide for all who should accompany him to England by canonries or other benefices.³ He had power of ecclesiastical censure against archbishops, bishops, monasteries, exempt or not exempt, and all others.⁴ He had power to depose all ecclesiastics in rebellion,⁵ and of appointing loyal clerks to their benefices.⁶ In the case of the

¹ MS., B. M., letter to Archdeacon of Paris.

² "Ad quorum observantiam ipsos decrevimus non tenere, eosdem prælatos et clericos per suspensionis sententiam ab officiis, dignitatibus, honoribus et beneficiis: comites vero, barones et laicos prædictos per privationem feudorum et omnium bonorum, quæ a quibusdam Ecclesiis prædicti regni et aliis detinent et alios spiritualiter et temporaliter, prout expedire videris." — MS., B. M., Nov. 23, 1263 See also the next letter.

³ "Non obstante Statuto Ecclesiarum ipsarum de certo clericorum numero, juramento, confirmatione, sive quâcunque firmitate, vallato." — Ibid. v. xi. p. 48.

⁴ "Communia universitatis et populos locorum quorumlibet."

⁵ Clerks, "indevoli, ingrati, inobedientes."

⁶ Even at this time preempory orders were given for provision for Italian

rebellions of archbishops or prelates, counts or barons, indulgences were to be granted to all who would serve or raise soldiers for the King, as if they went to the Holy Land :¹ the friar preachers and friar minors were to aid the King to the utmost.² After the award of the King of France, which the Pope confirmed,³ Urban becomes even more peremptory ; he commands the infamous provision, one of those of Oxford, to be erased from the statute book ; all those of Oxford are detestable and impious ; he marks with special malediction that which prohibited the introduction of apostolic bulls or briefs into the realm, and withheld the rich subsidies from Rome.⁴ The Archbishop was to excommunicate all who should not submit to the award. The King's absolute illimitable power is asserted in the strongest terms.⁵ The expulsion of strangers, and the assumption of exclusive authority by native Englishmen, are severely reprobated.⁶

But the Cardinal Legate dared not to land in the island — even the Archbishop Boniface (of Savoy) would not venture into his province. Erelong the

ecclesiastics in the English Church. John de Ebulo claimed the deanery of St. Paul's. The chapter resisted. He resigned the deanery, but accepted a canonry ; till a canonry should be vacant, a certain pension. — P. 170.

¹ Orvieto, Nov. 27, 1263.

² Ibid., Nov. 27.

³ Rymer, i. 776, 778, 780, 784.

⁴ The Pope's letters, at least, were after the award. "Nonnulli maledictionis alumpni, quedam statuta nepharia in depressionem libertatis ejusdem promulgasse dicuntur, videlicet quod quicumque literas apostolicas aut ipsius archiepiscopi in Angliam deferre præsumpserit, graviter puniatur." — Orvieto, Feb. 20, 1264.

⁵ "Plenaria potestate in omnibus et per omnia." — Ibid.

⁶ The King of France "Retractavit et cassavit illud statutum, per quod regnum Angliæ debebat per indigenas gubernari, et alienigenæ tenebantur ab eodem exire, ad illum minime reversuri." — Ibid.

whole realm, the King himself, and Prince Edward are in the power of the barons. The Legate must content himself with opening his court at Boulogne. There he issued his unobeyed citation to the barons to appear, pronounced against them the sentence of excommunication, and placed London and the Cinque Ports under an interdict.¹ Ugo Falcodi, when Pope, cherished a bitter remembrance of these affronting contempts.

Although the negotiations were all this time proceeding in secret with Charles of Anjou, the Pope cited Manfred to appear before him to answer ^{Affairs of Naples.} on certain charges, which he published to the world.² They comprehended various acts of cruelty, the destruction of the city of Aria by the Saracens, the execution, called murder, of certain nobles, contempt of the ecclesiastical interdict, attachment to Mohammedan rites, the murder of an ambassador of Conradin.³ Manfred approached the borders; but the Pope insisted that he should be accompanied by only eighty men: Manfred refused to trust himself to a Papal safe-conduct.

But as he was not permitted to approach in peace, Manfred, well informed of the transactions ^{Advance of Manfred.} with Charles of Anjou, threatened to approach in war.⁴ From Florence, from Pisa, from Siena, the German and Saracen, as well as the Apulian and Sicilian forces began to draw towards Orvieto. The Pope hastily summoned a Council: and some troops came to his aid from various quarters. But a

¹ "Propter imminentem turbationem." Feb. 15. His citations were to be valid, if issued in France. The Bishop of Lincoln was cited for various acts of contumacy to the Holy See. — June 4, 1264.

² Oct. 20, 1264.

³ Raynaldus, sub ann.

⁴ Giannone, xix. 1.

sudden event seemed to determine the descent of Charles of Anjou upon Italy, and brought at once the protracted negotiations, concerning the terms of his acceptance of the throne of Naples, to a close. The Roman people, having risen against the nobles, and cast many of them out of the city, determined on appointing a senator of not less than royal rank. One Charles of Anjou Senator of Rome. party proposed Manfred, another his son-in-law, the King of Arragon, a third Charles of Anjou. The Pope was embarrassed: he was compelled to maintain Charles of Anjou against his competitors: and yet a great sovereign as senator of Rome, and for life (as it was proposed), was the death-blow to the Papal rule in Rome. Charles of Anjou felt his strength; he yielded to the Pope's request to limit the grant of the senatorship to five years; but he seized the opportunity to lower the terms on which he was to be invested with the realm of Naples. He demanded a diminution of the tribute of ten thousand ounces of gold which Naples was to pay annually to the See of Rome: such demand was unjust to him who was about to incur vast expense in the cause of Rome; unjust to Naples, which would be burdened with heavy taxation; impolitic, as preventing the new King from treating his subjects with splendid liberality. He required that the descent of the crown should be in the female as well as in the male line: that he should himself judge of the number of soldiers necessary for the expedition. He demanded the abrogation of the stipulation, that if any of his posterity should obtain the Empire, Lombardy or Tuscany, the crown of Naples should pass from them; the enlargement of the provision, that only a limited extent of possession in Lombardy or

in Tuscany should be tenable with the Neapolitan crown.

Charles was so necessary to Urban, the weight of Urban's influence was so powerful in Rome, that the treaty was at length signed. Charles sent a representative to Rome to accept the Senatorship.¹

Manfred now kept no measures with the hostile Pope. His Saracen troops on one side, his German on the other, broke into the Roman territories. But a crusading army of Guelfs of some force had arisen around the Pope; and some failures and disasters checked the career of Manfred. Pandolf, Count of Anguillara, recovered Sutri from the Saracens. Peter de Vico, a powerful noble, had revolted from the Pope, and having secret intelligence in Rome, hoped to betray the city into the power of Manfred: he was repelled by the Romans. Percival d'Oria, who had captured many of the Guelfic castles, was accidentally drowned in the river Negra, ^{Oct. 2 or 10, 1264.} during a battle near Reate: his death was bruited abroad as a miracle. Yet was not the Pope safe; Orvieto began to waver: he set forth ^{Death of Urban IV. Oct. 2, 1264.} to Perugia; he died on the road.

Christendom at this peculiar crisis awaited with trembling anxiety the determination of the conclave: but this suspense of nearly five ^{Clement IV. Feb. 5, 1265.} months did not arise altogether out of the dissensions in that body. Urban IV. had secured the predominance of the French interest: the election had been long made before it was published. It had fallen on Ugo Falcodi, that Papal Legate, who, on the northern

¹ Charles agreed to surrender the senatorship when master of Naples. How far did he intend to observe this condition? — See Sismondi, p. 141.

shore of France, was issuing Urban's sentence of excommunication against the Barons of England, while that Pope was no longer living. Ugo Falcodi was born at St. Gilles upon the Rhône: he had been married before he took orders, and had two daughters. He was profoundly learned in the law; from the Archidiaconate of Narbonne he had been brought to Italy, and created Cardinal of St. Sabina. Of his policy there could be no doubt; Manfred has but a new and more vigorous enemy; Charles of Anjou a more devoted friend. The Cardinal of St. Sabina passed secretly over the Alps, suddenly appeared at Perugia, accepted the tiara, assumed the name of Clement IV., and then took up his residence at Viterbo.

Yet Manfred could hardly have dreaded a foe so active, so implacable, so unscrupulous, or Charles hoped for an ally so zealous, so obsequious, above all, so prodigal. Letters were despatched through Christendom, to England, to France, urging immediate succor to the Holy See, imperilled by the Saracen Manfred, and trusting for her relief only to the devout Charles. Everywhere the tenths were levied, notwithstanding the murmurs of Bishops and clergy; tenths still under the pretext of aid for Constantinople and Jerusalem. It was rebellion to refuse to pay; the Pope was even lavish of the Papal treasures; he pledged the ecclesiastical estates; usurious interest accumulated on the principal. A loan of 100,000 livres was raised on the security of the possessions of the Church in Rome (in vain many of the Cardinals protested), even on the churches from whence the Cardinals took their titles: St. Peter's, the Lateran, the Hospitals, and the convent of St. George were alone excepted. The Legates, the

Prelates, the Mendicants were ordered to preach the Crusade with unwearied activity. They had new powers of absolution; they might admit as soldiers of Christ incendiaries, those excommunicated for refusing to pay tenths, sacrilegious persons, astrologers, those who had struck a clerk, or sold merchandise to Mohammedans, ecclesiastics under interdict, or under suspension, married clerks; those who, in violation of the canons, had practised law or physic. All attempts were made to maintain the Papal interests in Rome, and to excite revolt in the kingdom of Naples.¹

Charles of Anjou had now declared himself Senator of Rome, and invested with the crown of Naples. He had been long collecting his forces for the conquest. But Italy might seem to refuse access to the stranger. The Ghibellines were in the ascendant in Lombardy. The Marquis Pallavicini and Buoso da Doara, with the Cremonese, watched the passes of the Alps. The fleets of Pisa and of Manfred swept the sea with eighty galleys; the mouth of the Tiber was stopped by a great dam of timber and stone. But courage and fortune favored Charles: he boldly set sail from Marseilles with hardly more than twenty galleys and one thousand men-at-arms. A violent storm scattered the fleet of Pisa and Naples: he entered the Ti-
ber, broke through all obstacles, and appeared Charles at Rome.
at Rome at Pentecost, the time appointed for his inauguration as Senator. He chose for his abode the Pope's Lateran palace. That was an usurpation which the Pope could not endure: he sent a strong remonstrance against the presumption of the Senator of Rome, who had dared without permission to occupy the abode of

¹ Martene. Compare Cherrier, iv. 79.

the Pope: he was commanded to quit the palace and seek some more fitting residence. Yet even at this time Clement IV. insisted on dictating the terms on which Charles was to hold the kingdom of Naples, its reversion to the Papacy in default of heirs of his line, its absolute incompatibility with the Empire, the tribute of eight thousand crowns of gold, the homage and the white horse in token of fealty. Manfred attempted to provoke Charles to battle before the arrival of his main army; he advanced with a large force, many of them Saracens, to the neighborhood of Rome. The prudence of the Pope restrained the impatience of Charles.¹

It was not till the end of the summer that the main army of Charles came down the pass of Mont Cenis into friendly Piedmont. It was splendidly provided, and boasted some of the noblest knights of France and Flanders. The Pope had absolved all those who had taken the cross for the Holy Land: equal hopes of Heaven were attached to this new Crusade against Manfred, whom it was the policy to represent as more than half a Saracen. The Legate, Cardinal of St. Cecilia, had exacted a tenth from the French clergy. Robert of Bethune took the command; Guy of Beauvais, Bishop of Auxerre, was among the most distinguished warriors; there were Vendôsmes, Montmorencies, Mirepoixs, De Montforts, Sullys, De Beaumonts.

Advance of
the army.

The Ghibellines made a great show of resistance: the Carroccios of Pavia, Cremona, and Piacenza moved out as to a great battle. But the French army passed on, threatened Brescia; Milan and the Marquis of Montferrat ventured not to take their part openly, but supplied them with provisions.

¹ Raynaldus, sub ann. 1265.

But through the treachery of the Ghibellines, bought, according to some writers of the time, by French gold, or intimidated by the great French force, which the Chronicles, perhaps faithfully recording the rumors of the day, represented as sixty thousand, forty thousand, thirty thousand strong, the allies of Manfred¹ finally stood aloof in sullen passiveness. The French reached the Po. They advanced still without serious encounter, and joined their master in Rome. Charles, In Rome.

though it was the depth of winter, allowed no long repose. He advanced to Ceperano, with the In Naples.

Legate, the Cardinal St. Angelo, preaching the Crusade on the way. Manfred prepared himself for a gallant resistance; but he had neither calculated on the treachery of some of his own subjects, nor on the impetuous valor of the French. The passage of the Garigliano was betrayed by the Count of Caserta. San Germano, in which he had secured a strong force and ample stores, was taken by assault. Manfred's courage was unshaken; he centred his army near Benevento, but he sent messengers to Charles to propose negotiations. "Tell the Sultan of Nocera that I will have neither peace nor treaty with him; I will send him to Hell, or he shall send me to Paradise!" Such was the reply of Charles of Anjou. The French army defiled into the plain before Benevento. Man-

Battle of Benevento. Feb. 6, 1266.
fred is accused of rashness for venturing on a decisive battle. The French army were in want of money and of provisions; a protracted war might have worn them out. Manfred's nephew, Conrad of Antioch, was in the Abruzzi, Count Frederick in Calabria,

¹ The annals of Modena give 5000 horse, 15,000 foot, 10,000 bowmen. — See the Chronicles in Muratori.

and the Count of Ventimiglia in Sicily; but Manfred perhaps knew that nothing less than splendid success could hold in awe the wavering fidelity of his subjects. He drew up his army in three divisions. On the French side appeared, beside the three, a fourth. "Who are these?" inquired Manfred. "The Guelfs of Florence and the exiles from other cities." "Where are the Ghibellines, for whom I have done and hazarded so much?" The Germans and the Saracens fought with desperate valor. Manfred commanded the third army of the Barons of Apulia to move to the charge. Some, among them the great Chamberlain, hesitated, turned, fled.¹ Manfred plunged in his desperation into the midst of the fray, and fell unknown by an unknown hand. The body was found after three days and recognized by a boor, who threw it across an ass, and went shouting along, "Who will buy King Manfred?" He was struck down by one of Manfred's Barons; the body was taken to King Charles.² Charles summoned the Barons who were prisoners, and demanded if it was indeed the body of Manfred. Galvano Lancia looked on it, hid his face in his hands, and burst into tears. The generous French urged that it should receive honorable burial. "It might be," said Charles, "were he not under excommunication." The body was hastily interred by the bridge of Benevento: the warriors, French and Apulian, cast each a stone, and a huge mound ap-

Death of
Manfred.

¹ Dante brands the treason of the Apulians: this was the field

"ove fu bugiardo
Ciaascum Pugliese." — *Inferno*, xxviii. 16.

² Compare the letter of Charles announcing the victory of the Pope, before the body was found.

peared,¹ like those under which repose the heroes of ancient times. But the Papal jealousy would not allow the Hohenstaufen to repose within the territory of the Church. The Archbishop of Cosenza, by the Feb. 26. command of the Pope, ordered him to be torn up from his rude sepulchre. He was again buried in unconsecrated ground, on the borders of the kingdom of Naples, near the river Verde.²

So perished the noble Manfred, a poet like his father, all accomplished as his father,³ a man of consummate courage and great ability. Naples could hardly have had a more promising founder for a native dynasty. But Naples was too near Rome; and the house of Hohenstaufen had not yet fulfilled its destiny.

The first act of the triumphant army of the Cross, under the Pope's ally, was the sacking of the Sack of Benevento. Papal city of Benevento, a general massacre of both sexes, of all ages, violation of women, even of women dedicated to God: the churches did not escape the common profanation. Charles was King of Naples: the Capital yielded, Capua surrendered the vast treasures accumulated by Manfred. The King's officers were weighing these treasures. "What need of scales?" said Ugo di Balzo, a Provençal knight: he kicked the whole into three portions: "This is for my Lord the King,

¹ Ricordano Malespini.

² "L' ossa del corpo mio sarieno ancora
In cò di ponte, presso a Benevento,
Sotta la guardia della grave mora;
Or le bagna la pioggia, e muove il vento.
Di fuor del regno, quasi lungo 'l Verde
Ove le trasmutò a lume spento."

Dante, *Purgat.* 111.

³ "Lo Re spesso la notte andava per Barletta, cantando Strambuotti e canzoni, che iva pigliando il fresco, e con esso ivano dei Musici Siciliani ch' erano gran Romanzatori." — Matteo Spinelli.

this for the Queen, this for your Knights." The whole of Apulia, Calabria, Sicily submitted to the Sovereign invested by the Pope.¹ But they soon began to appreciate the change, to which they had looked as a great deliverance, as the dawn of a golden age of peace and plenty. The French soldiers spread wanton devastation wherever they went, neither respecting property, nor the rights of men nor the honor of women. Naples was at first disposed to admire the magnificence of Charles and his Barons; but those who had reproved the luxuriousness of Frederick's or the ruder splendor of Manfred's court, found that of the Provençal King at least not more favorable to the higher morals.² In-

Tyranny of
the French.

stead of being relieved from their heavy taxation, they were the prey of still more merciless exaction. King Charles seized the books and registers of the royal revenues in the hands of Gazzolino di Murra. Every royal privilege, subsidy, collection, or tax was enforced with more rigorous severity. New justiciaries, officers of customs, notaries, and revenue collectors sprung up in hosts, draining without restraint the impoverished people. The realm began too late to deplore its own versatility, to look back on the days of good King Manfred. Thus are these feelings expressed by a Guelfic historian: "O King Manfred, little did we know thee when alive! Now that thou art dead, we

¹ Clement writes to Cardinal Ottobuoni, Legate in England: "Carissimus in Christo filius E. (C.) Rex Siciliæ illustris tenet totum regnum, illius hominis pestilentis cadaver putidum, uxorem et liberos optinens et thesaurum." — MS., B. M., May 1266. The March, Florence, Pistoia, Sienna, Pisa, had returned to their allegiance. Messengers were come from Uberto Pallavicini and the Cremonese. There were hopes of Genoa.

² Muratori writes thus: — "Per altro la venuta de' Franzesi quella fu, che cominciò ad introdurre il lusso, e qualche cosa di peggio e fece mutar i costumi degl' Italiani." — Sub ann.

deplore thee in vain ! Thou appearedst as a ravening wolf among the flocks of this kingdom ; now fallen by our fickleness and inconstancy under the present government, after which we groaned, we find that thou wert a lamb. Now we know by bitter comparison how mild was thy rule. We thought it hard that part of our substance must be yielded into thy hands, now we find that all our substance and even our persons are the prey of the stranger.”¹

Clement IV. could not close his ears to these sad complaints. He had forced himself to remon- The Pope. strate on the sack of Benevento ; but throughout Italy the Guelfs rose again to power, Florence was in their hands, Pisa made supplication to the Pope to be released from excommunication. In Milan there was a Provençal governor, whose cruelties even surpassed Italian cruelties. Charles was manifestly aspiring to be supreme in Italy.²

But the Pope did not neglect more remote offences. The Cardinal of St. Sabina had not forgotten England. the contemptuous refusal of the Barons of England to accept his mediation.³ Henry III. was too useful, too profitable a vassal of the Roman See to be abandoned to his unruly subjects. Immediately on his accession the Pope had sent the Cardinal of St. Hadrian (Otto- buoni) as Legate, with the same ample powers with which himself had been invested.⁴ An interdict was

¹ Saba Malespina, iii. 16.

² See all the historians.

³ Letter to the Queen, complaining of the insolence of the Barons, who had not permitted him to land in England when Legate. — MS., B. M., v. xii. p. 3.

⁴ The bulls addressed to Ottobuoni are transcripts of those before addressed to the Cardinal St. Sabina, the usual form, *mutatis mutandis*. — MS., B. M. They filled several pages.

laid upon the island if it refused to admit the Legate. If the Legate should not be permitted to land, he was to transmit inhibitions to the clergy, having equal force, inhibitions to allow no matrimonial rites to the rebels, or to communicate with them in any way whatever.¹ He had the same authority to thrust his followers into dignities or benefices from which the rebellious clergy or those connected with the rebels were to be ejected. All sons of rebel Barons or Nobles, all nephews of rebel Churchmen were to be deprived of their parsonages or benefices, and declared incapable of holding them.² No promotions were to be made to bishoprics or archbishoprics without express consent of the Holy See.³ It was admitted that many Bishops were on the side of the Barons; no favor was to be shown to those of London, Worcester, Lincoln, or Ely; they were on no account to be released from excommunication.⁴ Tenths were to be levied for the Holy War.⁵ The Legate was to preach or cause to be preached a Crusade in England and even in Germany against the insurgent Barons. Louis of France was urged to take arms in defence of the common cause of monarchy against those rebels who were accused of a design to throw off altogether the kingly sway. Nothing less than a general league of Princes could put down those sons of wrath and of treason, the Barons of England.⁶

¹ Ibid., dated Perugia, June 1, 1265, p. 119. Since he had excommunicated "*nonnullos barones et fautores eorum, et inhabitatores Quinque Portuum*," if any of them had obtained letters of absolution, "*in ægritudine verâ aut simulatâ*," unless they abandoned the party of Leicester they were to be as heathens and publicans.

² Ibid., same date.

³ Ibid., same date.

⁴ Ibid., some months later, Oct. 1265.

⁵ Ibid., July 1. The Cistercians, Carthusians, Templars, Hospitallers, Teutonic Knights, Sisters of St. Clare, were alone exempt.

⁶ Ibid., Perugia, May 6, 1265, p. 75, &c.

The Pope, as Cardinal Legate, had excommunicated Simon de Montfort, Roger Earl of Norfolk, Hugo the Chief Justiciary, the City of London, and the Cinque Ports; he had summoned four of the English Prelates before him at Boulogne, and ordered them to publish the excommunication in England. The excommunication had been taken from the unreluctant hands of the Bishops. The excommunicated had appealed to the Pope; the appeal was ratified in a convocation of the clergy. But the excommunication was solemnly confirmed at Perugia. "Nothing could be done unless that turbulent man of sin (Leicester) and all his race were plucked up out of the realm."¹ The new Cardinal Legate was urged to hasten to England to consummate his work.

Ere he had ceased to be Cardinal Legate, the Pope (Ugo Falcodi) had heard at Boulogne the fatal tidings of the battle of Lewes, the captivity of the King and of Prince Edward. Then after his accession had come the news of the escape of Prince Edward, and the revolt of the Earl of Gloucester from the Barons. The Pope wrote in triumph to the Prince,² urging him to make every effort to release his father from slavery; the excommunication was at once removed from the Earl of Gloucester.³ The tidings of the battle of Evesham, of the death of Simon Earl of Leicester, filled him with melancholy and joy.⁴ Yet extraordinary as it may seem, Simon de Montfort, excommunicate by

¹ Epist. ad Card. St. Hadrian. "Nisi dictus vir pestilens cum totâ suâ progenie de regno Angliæ avellatur." — July 19, 1265. At this time Manfred was advancing on Rome.

² To Prince Edward. The letter enters into some details.

³ Ibid., p. 191.

⁴ "Læta nobis et tristia enarrastis." — Clement IV., Epist. i. 89.

the Pope, to the Pope the Man of Sin, was the Saint and Martyr of popular love and worship;¹ he was equalled with Becket.² Poetry, Latin, English, French, celebrated, sanctified, canonized him. His miracles, in their number, wonderfulness, and in their attestations might have moved the jealousy of St. Francis or of Becket himself.³ Prayers were addressed to him;⁴ prayer was offered through his intercession.⁵

The King's victory seemed complete, the Barons
 Victory of the King. crushed, the liberties of England buried in
 the grave of Simon de Montfort. The Cardinal Legate crossed to England with the Queen. The Queen Eleanor was not the least odious of the foreigners who ruled the feeble mind of the King: to her influence had been attributed the unjust, ill-considered
 The Legate, Oct. 29, 1265. award of Louis of France. The Legate assumed a kind of dictatorial authority.⁶ In the church of Westminster, the splendid foundation of

¹ Rishanger says that all ranks heard of his death with the most profound sorrow, "præcipue religiosi, qui partibus illis favebant." — Chronic. p. 48.

² See in Wright's Political Songs that on the battle of Lewes. After his death we read in another: —

" Mes par sa mort, le cuens Monfort
 Conquist la victoire,
 Comme li Martyr de Canterbyr
 Finist sa vie." (p. 125);

and the long Latin poem, p. 71.

³ See the "Miracula," published by Mr. Halliwell at the end of Rishanger, Camden Society, 1840.

⁴ "Salve Simon Montefortis,
 Totius flos militiæ.
 Duras passus poenas mortis,
 Protector gentis Angliæ."

⁵ "Ora pro nobis, Beate Simon, ut digni simus promissionibus Christi." — Ibid. p. 109.

⁶ See the Papal bulls, gratulatory to the King and Prince, and admonitory to the Barons to return to the King's allegiance. — Rymer, i. 817, 819.

Henry III. (under whose shadow I wrote these lines), he appeared in his full scarlet pontifical robes, recited the act of excommunication passed on Simon de Montfort and all his adherents, abrogated all the oaths sworn by the King, declared null and void all the constitutions and provisions of the realm.¹ At Northampton he held a council, and by name confirmed the excommunication of the Prelates who had made common cause with the Barons, Winchester, Worcester, London, Chichester.² The Pope, while he made large grants of the tenths, and triumphed in the King's triumph, in more Christian spirit enjoined him to use his victory with mercy and moderation.³ If any mercy was shown to the persons (and this is doubtful, for all the bravest and most formidable had perished in the field), there was none to their estates. The obsequious Parliament passed a sweeping sentence of confiscation on the lands of all who had joined or favored De Montfort. The Legate was not less severe against the obnoxious clergy.⁴ There was a wide and general ejection of all who had been or were suspected of having been on the proscribed side. The Pope is again busy in reaping for his own colleagues and followers some grains of the golden harvest. Demands are made, at first modest, for prebends, for pensions in favor of Roman ecclesiastics.⁵ He is compelled by the

¹ Wilkes, 72.

² Rishanger, p. 47.

³ Rymer, *loc. citat.*

⁴ "Qui non solum et post terras et possessiones occisorum in bello et captivorum necessaria etiam bona tam spiritualia quam temporalia religiosorum violavere, nulli parcentes ordini, dignitati, vel ecclesiasticæ libertati . . . infinitam pecuniam ab eis immisericorditer extorserunt, abbates et quascunque domos religiosas tantæ suppeditationi mancipando quod vix aut nunquam poterunt respirare." — Rishanger, p. 48.

⁵ MS, B. M., p. 202. Assignment of 260 marks on England to the Bishop

poverty of the Cardinals to become more pressing, more exorbitant in his exactions.

During the next year there is a formidable reaction ;
Reaction.
A.D. 1266.
a wide and profound dissatisfaction had spread through the realm. The discontented are defending themselves with desperate resolution in the isle of Ely. Rome is alarmed by the gloomy news from England : the Pope is trembling for the lives of the King, the Queen, and the Prince ; he is trembling for the irrecoverable loss of that noble fief of the See of Rome.¹ The affrighted Cardinal is disposed to abandon his hopeless mission. The Pope reproves him for his cowardice, but leaves it to his discretion whether he will remain or not in the contumacious and ungrateful island.²

The King's cause again prospers : at Christmas the King and the Legate are seen dining together in public at Westminster. The indignant people remark that the seat of honor, the first service of all the dishes are reserved to the Legate ; the King sits lower, and partakes of the best fare, but after the Legate.³ At St. Edmondsbury the ecclesiastics resisted the demand not

of Ostia and Velletri, "propter egestatem." One or two benefices to be obtained in England to make up this sum. "In eundem modum pro domino veterrano (Velletri) cccxxvi. marks." He intends to write, on account of the general poverty of the Cardinals, not only "pro duobus, pro pluribus, licet non in tantâ summâ sed minore." Perugia, Oct. 26, 1265, p. 117. "Inportabilis fratrum persuasio, quæ fonte liberalitatis ipsius qui ad Romanam Ecclesiam de mundi diversis partibus fluere consuevit, pæne, vel quasi penitus arefacto, crescit, nec cessat crescere." — P. 223.

¹ "Nihil aliud esset penitus, nisi totum everti negotium, Regem, Reginam et liberos tradi morti, et Ecclesiæ Romanæ feudum tam nobile sine spe qualibet recuperationis amitti." — MS., B. M., p. 233.

² Ibid., May 16, 1266.

³ "Legato in sedili regis collocato, singulisque ferculis coram eo primitus appositis, et postremo coram rege, unde murmurabant multi in aulâ regis." — Rishanger, p. 59.

only of the tenths, but of thirty thousand marks more, claimed by the Pope as arrears of the King's debt for the subjugation of Naples.¹

About a year and a half after, at the close of the Pontificate of Clement IV., the Cardinal Leg-
 ate holds a Council of the Church of Eng-^{Council in}
 land and Ireland in the cathedral of St. Paul. The
 famous constitutions of Ottobuoni, the com-^{Constitutions}
 pletion and confirmation of those of Cardinal of Ottobuoni.
 Otho, are passed, which were held for some time as the canon law of England.² Of these constitutions some must be noticed, as giving a view of the religion of the times. I. The absolute exemption of the property of the Church from all taxation by the state, the obedience of the laity to the clergy, were asserted in the fullest and most naked simplicity.³ II. One was directed against the clergy bearing arms. Some of the clergy are described (awful wickedness!) as little better than robber chieftains.⁴ It was forgotten that but a few years before the Archbishop of Canterbury had been in arms with the Archbishop of Lyons before Turin; that French Bishops were in the army of Charles of Anjou, the army blessed, sanctified by the Pope! III. Pluralities were generally condemned;⁵ pluralities without

¹ Rishanger, p. 61.

² April 21, 1268. Wilkins's Concilia. It has been suggested to me that the author of the constitutions may have been no less than Benedetto Gaetani, afterwards Boniface VIII. He was the companion and counsellor of Ottobuoni in England.

³ "Nec alicui liceat censum ponere super ecclesiam Dei. Ammonemus Regem et principes et omnes qui in potestate sunt, ut cum magnâ humilitate archiepiscopis omnibusque aliis episcopis obediant."

⁴ "In his ergo tam horrendis sceleribus clericos debacchantes" — they had been described as joining bands of robbers — "prosequimur excommunicatione, deprivatione." — Art. viii.

⁵ John Maunsel is described (Rishanger, p. 12) as "multarum in Angliâ

Papal dispensations altogether proscribed.¹ IV. There was a strong canon against the married clergy: not merely were many clergy married,² but the usage existed to a great extent of the transmission of benefices from father to son, and these benefices were not seldom defended by violence and force of arms.³

We return to Italy, with a glance at Spain, and the earlier years of Clement's Pontificate. The triumphs of James, the King of Arragon, over the Saracens of Spain, and the capture of Murcia, called forth the triumphant gratulations of the Pope.

James of
Aragon.

rector ecclesiarum et possessor reddituum quorum non erat numerus, ita quod ditior clericus eo non in orbe videretur." Mr. Halliwell quotes the Chron. Mailros. as giving him 700 livings, bringing in 18,000 marks. I cannot find the passage.

¹ Henry de Wingham is a good example of what might be and was done by Papal dispensations (MS., B. M., ix. p. 314). Wingham has license to hold the deanery of St. Martin's-le-Grand, the chancellorship of Exeter, a prebend of Salisbury, ac *universos alios personatus, etiam alia beneficia* (dated Anagni, July 23, 1259). A month after De Wingham (of whom Paris speaks as a disinterested man, *sub ann.* 1257) is bishop elect of London: he petitions to hold all these benefices with London for five years. He was also Lord Chancellor. The nephew of this poor man, holding only two livings, has Papal license to hold two more. — P. 411. Anagni, Aug. 28. 1259.

² "Nisi clerici et maximè qui in sacris ordinibus constituti, qui in domibus suis detinent publicè concubinas." — Art. viii.

³ The MS., B. M., are full of notices of married clergy in England. Letter to the Archbishop of York (xi. 124). Sons succeeded to their fathers' benefices, "quidam in ecclesiis, in quibus patres ministrarint eorum, se immediatè patribus ejus substituti, tanquam jure hereditario possidere sanctuarium Dei." The same in diocese of Lincoln, p. 132; Worcester, p. 136; Carlisle, p. 177. Complaints to Bishop of Salisbury of priests who have "focarie." To Bishop of Coventry, of their holding these benefices "violenter et armatâ manu," Dec. 21, 1235. So also to Bishop of Norwich, June 12, 1240; Winchester, p. 5 and 35, 1243. The Synod of Exeter (Wilkins, Concilia, c. xviii. p. 142) complains of clerks on their death-beds providing for their concubines and children out of the ecclesiastical revenues, "præsumptione tam damnatâ in extremis laborantes, et de infernis minimè cogitantes in suis ultimis voluntatibus . . . bona ecclesiæ concubinis relinquere non formidant." These wills were declared illegal.

But James of Arragon was not to be indulged in weaknesses unbecoming a Christian warrior. The Pope summoned him to break the chains in which he was fettered by a beautiful mistress, and to return to his lawful wife: he urged him to imitate the holy example of Louis of France. King James pleaded that his wife was a leper, and demanded the dissolution of the marriage. "Thinkest thou," rejoined the Pope, "that if all the Queens of the earth were lepers, we would allow Kings to join in adulterous commerce with other women? Better that all the royal houses should wither root and branch." He put the obedience of the King of Arragon to another test: he ordered him inexorably to expel all Mussulmans from his dominions, to depose all the Jews from the high places which they held in this as in many of the Spanish kingdoms.¹

In less than two years after the conquest of Naples, the insupportable tyranny of the French un-
 der Charles of Anjou, and the resentment of Naples.
Conradin.
A. D. 1267. the Ghibellines throughout Italy, had wrought up a spirit of wide-spread revolt. The young Conradin could alone deliver Sicily from the foreign yoke, check the revengeful superiority of the Guelfs, and restore the now lamented house of Hohenstaufen. Many secret messages were sent from Tuscany and Lombardy. Galvano and Frederick di Lancia, and the two chiefs of the house of Capece, whose lives had been excepted from the general proscription of Manfred's partisans, found their way to Germany. They called on Conradin to assert his hereditary rights; to appear as a deliverer from foreign oppression. The youth, not yet sixteen, listened with too eager avidity. At the End of 1267.

¹ Clement, Epist. Raynaldus, sub ann.

head of four thousand German troops he crossed the Alps, and held his court at Verona.

Pope Clement heard the intelligence with dismay. He instantly cited the presumptuous boy, who had
A.D. 1268. dared to claim a kingdom granted away by the See of Rome, to answer before his liege lord at Viterbo. There, in the Cathedral of Viterbo, in May, and on the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, he proclaimed his excommunication. He wrote to Florence to warn the Republic of "the young serpent which had sprung up from the blood of the old." He wrote to Ottocar, King of Bohemia, to make a diversion by attacking the Swabian possessions of Conradin. He declared Conradin deposed from the kingdom of Jerusalem. At the same time he wrote to Charles of Anjou, in terms which showed his own consciousness that the danger was in the tyranny and in the hatred of Charles rather than in the strength or popularity of Conradin. He entreated him "to moderate the horrible exactions enforced under the royal seal;¹ to listen to the petitions of his people; to put some check on the wasteful extravagance of his court; to keep a balance of his receipts and expenditure; to place on the seat of justice men of incorruptible integrity, with ample salaries, so as to be superior to bribery; not to permit unnecessary appeals to the King; to avoid all vexatious inquisitions; not to usurp the guardianship of orphans; to punish all attempts to corrupt magistrates; not to follow the baleful example of his predecessor in encroaching on the rights of the Church."²

¹ "Sigillo tuo legem impera, ut tollatur infamia de horrendis exactionibus eo nomine factis" *et seq.* Clem. Ep.

² See the letter of Pope Clement in Martene, and in Raynaldus, sub ann.

Yet this King, who needed these sage admonitions as to the administration of his kingdom, was raised at this very juncture by the Pope to the extraordinary office now vacant — an office the commanding title of which was ill-suited to the man and to the times — that of Peacemaker,¹ or Conservator of the Peace throughout Tuscany and all the provinces subject to the Roman empire; in other words, to keep down the Ghibellines, and by force of arms to compel them to lay down their arms.² King Alfonso of Castile heard with jealousy of this new title, which sounded as though Charles of Anjou was usurping the prerogative of the Empire, if not intending to supplant both himself and his competitor, Richard of Cornwall. The Pope was compelled at once to soothe and to alarm the Spaniard; to allay his fears as to any designs of Charles upon the Empire, not without some significant hint that the coronation by the Archbishop of Cologne was indispensable for a just title to the Empire; and the Archbishop of Cologne had crowned Richard. Alfonso was awed into silence, if not satisfied.³

But, not at the instigation, nor with any encouragement from the King of Castile, two of his brothers had

¹ "Paciarium non partiarium."

² There is a curious letter from the Pope to the Cardinal St. Hadrian. MS., B. M. When he had created Charles paciarius, "opponentibus Senensibus, Pisanis et pluribus Ghibellinis." The Romans, under the senator, Henry of Castile, were in league with the Ghibellines. Henry had taken some cities, and seized in Rome the brothers Napoleon and Mattheo Orsini, Angelo Malebranca, John Savelli, Peter Stefaneschi, Richard Annibaleschi, some of whom he had sent by night prisoners to Monticelli. "We would, as far as possible, war with the Romans: Conradin is in Verona with all Lombardy, except Pavia, and the march of Treviso. Sicily is in full revolt under Frederick of Castile." "God's will be done," concludes the devout Pope. — Viterbo, Nov. 23, 1267.

³ Clement, Epist.

become the most dangerous adversaries of the Pope. Henry and Frederick of Castile had been driven from their native land,¹ had taken to a wild adventurous life, and found hospitality at the court of the King of Tunis. It was said that they had adopted at least Mohammedan manners, attended Mohammedan rites, and more than half embraced the Mohammedan creed.² They returned to Europe. Frederick landed in Sicily, where some short time after he raised the standard of Conradin. Henry went on to Italy; he was received by his cousin, Charles of Anjou, who bestowed on him sixty thousand crowns. Henry had hopes, fostered by the Papal Court, if not by the Pope, of obtaining the investiture of Sardinia, which the Pope would fain wrest from the rule of Ghibelline Pisa. But Charles of Anjou grew jealous of Henry of Castile; he too had pretensions on Sardinia; it was withdrawn from the grasp of Henry; and the Castilian was brooding in dissatisfaction and disappointment, when the opportunity of revenge arose. The people of Rome were looking abroad for a Senator. Charles had surrendered or forfeited his office when he became King of Naples. A short-lived rule of two concurrent Senators had increased the immitigable feud. Angelo Capucio was a noble Roman, still attached to the fallen fortunes of Manfred. By his influence, notwithstanding the repugnance of the rest of the nobles, and strong opposition from some of the Cardinals, Henry

Henry of
Castile.

¹ They seem to have been at the head of a constitutional opposition against their brother Alfonso, who aspired to rule without the Cortes.

² Mariana describes Henry as "in rebus bellicis potens et strenuus, et nimium callidus, sed sceleratissimus et in fidei catholice cultu non diligens prosecutor." For private reasons for the hatred of Henry and Charles, see Hispan. Illustrat. ii. p. 647; Amari; Vespro Siciliano, ciii. p. 30.

of Castile was chosen Senator of Rome. He commenced his rule with some of those acts of stern equity which ever overawed and captivated the Roman people. Clement too late began to suspend his design of investing Charles of Anjou with the throne of Sardinia, to which Henry might again aspire. But the hatred of Charles was deep in Henry's heart; he openly displayed the banner of Conradin. Galvano Rome for Conradin. Lancia, the kinsman and most active partisan of Manfred, hastened to Rome; and the Pope heard with indignation that the Swabian standard was waving from the hallowed Lateran, where Lancia had taken up his quarters, and was parading his forces before it.¹ The censures of the Pontiff addressed to the authorities of Rome made no impression. The Senator summoned the people to the Capitol; his armed bands were in readiness; he seized two of the Orsini, and sent them prisoners to the strong castle of Monticelli, near Tivoli; two of the Savelli were cast into the dungeons under the Capitol, many others into different prisons; Henry of Castile took possession of St. Peter's and of the Papal palaces.²

The few German troops with which Conradin had crossed the Alps fell off for want of pay:³ but the Ghibelline interest, the nobler feelings, awak- Movements of Conradin. A.D. 1268. ened in favor of the gallant boy thus cruelly deprived of his inheritance, and the growing hatred of the French soon gathered an army around him. He

¹ "Ac loca, specialiter Laterani, ad quæ ingredienda viri etiam justī vix digni sunt habiti, pompis lascivientibus circuire, ac ibidem hospitium accipere non expavit." — Lib. Pontif. quoted in Raynald, 1267.

² See note above from MS., B. M.

³ It is curious to observe (in Böhmer's Register), of the few acts of Conradin in Italy, how large a part are on the pawning (Verpfändung) of estates or rights for sums of money. — p. 287.

set out from faithful Verona ; he was received in Pavia, in Pisa, in Sienna, as the champion of Ghibellinism ; as the lawful King of Sicily.¹ In Apulia, the Saracens of Lucera were in arms ; in Sicily, Frederick of Castile, with the Saracens and some of Manfred's partisans, who had taken refuge in Africa and now returned. The island was in full revolt ; the Lieutenant of Charles was defeated ; except Messina, Palermo, and Syracuse, Sicily was in the power of Conradin. Already, in his agony of apprehension, the Pope, finding that Charles was still in Tuscany, pressing his advantages in favor of the Guelfs of Florence, hastily summoned him to return to Naples. " Why do we write to thee as King, while thou seemest utterly to disregard thy kingdom ? It is without a head, exposed to the Saracens and to the traitorous Christians ; already exhausted by your robberies, it is now plundered by others. The locust eats what the canker-worm has left. Spoilers will not be wanting, so long as its defender is away. If you love the kingdom, think not that the Church will incur the toil and cost of conquering it anew ; you may return to your Countship, and, content with the vain name of king, await the issue of the contest. Perhaps, in reliance on your merits, you expect a miracle to be wrought in your favor ; that God will act in your behalf, while you thus follow your own counsels, and despise those of others. I had resolved not to write to thee on this affair : my venerable brother, Rudolph, Bishop of Alba, has prevailed on me to send you these few last words." ²

¹ In Pavia, March 22 ; in Pisa, April 4 ; in Sienna, July 7 ; in Rome, July 7 or August 11. In Rome he is said to have had 5000 German knights, Henry of Castile 800 Spaniards.

² Clement, *Epist.* apud Raynald., A. D. 1269, p. 233.

Charles obeyed, and returned in all haste to Naples ; he formed the siege of Lucera, the strong-
 hold of his most dangerous foes, the Saracens. Conradin advances to Rome.

Conradin advanced towards Rome ; he marched under the walls of Viterbo, intending perhaps to insult or intimidate the Pope, who had a strong garrison in the city. The affrighted Cardinals thronged around the Pope, who was at prayer. "Fear not," he said ; "they will be scattered like smoke." He even ascended the walls, beneath which Conradin and his young and faithful friend Frederick of Austria were prancing on their stately coursers. "Behold the victims for the sacrifice."¹

The dark vaticinations of the Pope, though sadly verified by the event (perhaps but the echo of the event), if bruited abroad in Rome, had no more effect than the ecclesiastical thunders which at every onward step Clement had hurled with reiterated solemnity at the head of Conradin. Notwithstanding these excommunications, the Romans welcomed with the loudest acclamations Conradin, called by the Pope "the accursed branch of an accursed stem, the manifest enemy of the Church : " "Rome had calmly seen that son of malediction, Galvano Lancia, who had so long walked the broad road to perdition, from whose approach they should have shrunk with scorn, displaying the banner of Conradin from the Lateran." It was an event as yet unheard, which disturbed the soul of the Pontiff, that although occasional discords, and even the scandal of wars, had taken place between the Pope and his City, now their fidelity should revolt to the persecutor of the Church ; that Rome should incur the guilt of

¹ Raynald. c. xxii. Freher.

matricide.¹ Yet not the less did the Senator and Rome welcome the young Swabian. Henry the Senator marched at the head of the Roman forces in Conradin's army, having first plundered the churches and monasteries. The Pope heard with deeper resentment that the Lateran, the churches of St. Paul, St. Basil on the Aventine, Santa Sabina, and other convents, had been obliged to surrender their treasures, which were expended upon the army of the excommunicate.²

But the destiny which hovered over the house of Hohenstaufen had not yet exhausted its vials of wrath. At the battle of Tagliacozzo, the French for once condescended to depend not on their impetuous valor alone, but on prudence, military skill, and a reserve held by the aged Alard de St. Valery, a French knight, just returned from that school of war, Palestine. St. Valery's eight hundred men retrieved the lost battle. Conradin, Frederick of Austria, Henry of Castile, were in the hands of the remorseless conqueror. Conradin had almost bribed John Frangipani, Lord of Astura, to lend him a bark to escape. The Frangipani sold him for large estates in the principedom of Benevento.³

Christendom heard with horror that the royal brother of St. Louis, that the champion of the Church, after a mock trial, by the sentence of one judge, Robert di Lavena — after an unanswerable

Battle of
Tagliacozzo.

Execution of
Conradin.

¹ Apud Raynald. A.D. 1269.

² Ibid.

³ "En 1256, quatre ans après les Vêpres Siciliennes, un amiral de Jacques d'Arragon emporta Astura, qu'il réduisit en cendres. Les biens des Frangipani furent ravagés; Jacob, le fils de Jean, périt dans le combat. Sa postérité s'éteignit, et, de cette branche, dont le blason était taché du sang royal, il ne reste qu'un souvenir de déshonneur." Astura was near the spot where Cicero was killed. — Cherrier, iv. p. 212.

pleading by Guido de Suzaria, a famous jurist, — had condemned the last heir of the Swabian house — a rival king, who had fought gallantly for his hereditary throne — to be executed as a felon and a rebel on a public scaffold. So little did Conradin dread his fate, that when his doom was announced, he was playing at chess with Frederick of Austria. “Slave,” said Conradin to Robert of Bari, who read the fatal sentence, “do you dare to condemn as a criminal the son and heir of kings? Knows not your master that he is my equal, not my judge?” He added, “I am a mortal, and must die; yet ask the kings of the earth if a prince be criminal for seeking to win back the heritage of his ancestors. But if there be no pardon for me, spare, at least, my faithful companions; or if they must die, strike me first, that I may not behold their death.”¹ They died devoutly, nobly. Every circumstance aggravated the abhorrence: it was said — perhaps it was the invention of that abhorrence — that Robert of Flanders, the brother of Charles, struck dead the judge who had presumed to read the iniquitous sentence.² When Conradin knelt, with uplifted hands, awaiting the blow of the executioner, he uttered these last words — “O my mother! how deep will be thy sorrow at the news of this day!”³ Even the followers of Charles could hardly restrain their pity and indignation. With Conradin died his young and valiant

¹ Bartholomeo di Neocastro apud Muratori, p. 1027.

² There is evidence, it appears, that this judge, or prothonotary, was alive some years after.

³ “Ad cœlum jungebat palmas, mortemque inevitabilem patienter expectans, suum Domino spiritum commendabat: nec divertebat caput. sed exhibebat se quasi victimam et cesoris truces ictus in patientiâ expectabat.” — Malespina apud Muratori, viii. 851.

friend, Frederick of Austria, the two Lancias, two of the noble house of Donaticcio of Pisa. The inexorable Charles would not permit them to be buried in consecrated ground.

The Pope himself was accused as having counselled this atrocious act. One of those sentences, which from its pregnant brevity cleaves to the remembrance, lived long in the memory of the Ghibellines: "The life of Conradin is the death of Charles, the death of Conradin the life of Charles." But to have given such advice, Clement must have belied his own nature, his own previous conduct, as well as his religion. Throughout he had been convinced of the impolicy, and was doubtless moved with inward remorse at the cruelties of Charles of Anjou. Clement had tried to mitigate the tyranny of the King. Even the colder assent, at least the evasive refusal to interfere on the side of mercy — "It becomes not the Pope to counsel the death of any one," is hardly in the character of Clement IV.¹ There is another, somewhat legendary, story. Ambrose of Sienna, afterwards a Saint, presented himself on the first news of the capture of Conradin before the Pope; he dwelt on the parable of the prodigal son, received with mercy into his father's house. "Ambrose," said the Pope, "I would have mercy, not sacrifice." He turned to the cardinals, "It is not the monk that speaks, it is the Spirit of the Most High."²

But if he was responsible only for not putting forth the full Papal authority to command an act of wisdom

¹ Compare the fair and honest Tillemont, *Vie de St. Louis*, vi. 129. Poor Conradin had said in one of his proclamations of Clement's hostility, *Clemens cujus nomen ab effectu non modicè distat*. — *B. Museum Chronicon*, p. 273.

² *Vit. S. Ambrosii Senen.* apud Bollandistas, c. iii.

as of compassion, Clement himself was soon called to answer before a higher tribunal. On the 29th October the head of Conradin fell on the scaffold; on the 29th November died Pope Clement IV. It is his praise that he did not exalt his kindred — that he left in obscurity the husbands of his daughters.¹ But the wonder betrayed by this praise shows at once how Christendom had already been offended; it was prophetic of the stronger offence which nepotism would hereafter entail upon the Papal See.

¹ “Nec invenitur exaltâsse parentes, totus Deo dicatus.” — Ptolem. Luc. xxxviii. Tillemont has collected the passages (and there are many) to the praise of Clement IV. Tillemont is not perhaps less inclined to admire him because he was a Frenchman. — Vie de St. Louis, iv. p. 350 *et seq.*

CHAPTER IV.

GREGORY X. AND HIS SUCCESSORS.

AFTER the death of Clement IV. there was a vacancy of more than two years in the Pontificate. The cause of this dissension among the fifteen Cardinals¹ nowhere transpires: it may have been personal jealousy, where there was no prelate of acknowledged superiority to demand the general suffrage. The French Cardinals may have been ambitious, under the dominant influence of the victorious Charles of Anjou, to continue the line of French Pontiffs: the Italians, both from their Italian patriotism and their jealousy of the power of Charles, may have stubbornly resisted such promotion. During this vacancy, Charles of Anjou was revenging himself with his characteristic barbarity on his rebellious kingdom, compressing with an iron hand the hatred of his subjects, which was slowly and sullenly brooding into desperation. He was thus unknowingly preparing his own fall by the terrible reaction of the Sicilian Vespers. He was becoming in influence, manifestly aspiring to be, through the triumphant Guelfic factions, the real master of the whole of Italy.

At this period was promulgated an Edict, before briefly alluded to,² apparently unobserved, but which,

¹ Ciacconius gives 17 — 5 or 6 French, 4 Romans. — p. 178.

² See back, page 40. *Ordonnances des Rois*, i. 97, March, 1268. Sis-

nevertheless, in the hands of the great lawyers, who were now establishing in the minds of men, especially in France, a rival authority to that of the clergy, became a great Charter of Independence to the Gallican Church. The Pragmatic Sanction, limiting the interference of the court of Rome in the ^{Pragmatic Sanction.} elections of the clergy, and directly denying its right of ecclesiastical taxation, being issued by the most religious of Kings, by a King a canonized Saint, seemed so incongruous and embarrassing, that desperate attempts have been made to question its authenticity: Louis IX. might seem, in his servile time, himself servilely religious, to be suddenly taking the lofty tone of Charlemagne. But it was this high religiousness of Louis which suggested, and which enabled him to promulgate this charter of liberty: as he intended none, so he might disguise even to himself the latent, rather than avowed hostility to the power of Rome. Among the dearest objects to the heart of Louis was the reformation of the clergy; that reformation not aiming at the depression, but tending to the immeasurable exaltation of their power, by grounding it on their piety and holiness. It is to this end that he asserts the

mondi, viii. p. 104. I cannot see the force of the objection to the authenticity of the Ordinance, to which Mr. Hallam seems to give some weight, that St. Louis had not any previous difference with the See of Rome. The right of patronage seems to have been a standing cause of quarrel throughout Christendom, as we have seen in England. See, too, in Tillemont, iv. p. 408-412 — the king (Louis) asserting his rights of patronage to the prebends of Rheims and the archdeaconry of Sens against the Pope. Tillemont does not doubt its authenticity, and refers to these disputes as a possible cause. See also the strange account of John of Canterbury, who paid 10,000 livres Tournois for confirmation in the Archbishopric of Rheims. John had expended it for the honor of his Holiness and the Roman court. The Pope *blushed* at this great expense for his honor. — p. 410. Clement, Epist. p. 308.

PROPERTY OF
NORTHEASTERN BIBLE INSTITUTE LIBRARY
ESSEX FELS, NEW JERSEY

absolute power of jurisdiction in the clergy, the rights of patrons, the right of free elections in the cathedrals and other churches. The Edict was issued in the name of “Louis by the grace of God, King of the French. To insure the tranquil and wholesome state of the Church in our realm ; to increase the worship of God, in order to promote the salvation of the souls of the faithful in Christ ; to obtain for ourselves the grace and succor of Almighty God, to whose dominion and protection our realm has been ever subject, as we trust it will ever be, we enact and ordain by this edict, maturely considered and of perpetual observance : —

“ I. That the prelates, patrons, and ordinary collators to benefices in the churches of our realm, have full enjoyment of their rights, and that the jurisdiction of each be wholly preserved.

“ II. That the cathedral and other churches of our realm have full freedom of election in every point and particular.

“ III. We will and ordain that the pestilential crime of simony, which undermines the Church, be forever banished from our realm.

“ IV. We will and ordain in like manner that promotions, collations, provisions and dispositions of the prelacies, the dignities, the benefices, of what sort soever, and of the ecclesiastical offices of our realm, be according to the disposition, ordinance, and determination of the common law, the sacred councils of the Church of God, and the ancient institutions of the Holy Fathers.

“ V. We will that no one may raise or collect in any manner exactions or assessments of money, which have been imposed by the court of Rome, by which

our realm has been miserably impoverished, or which hereafter shall be imposed, unless the cause be reasonable, pious, most urgent, of inevitable necessity, and recognized by our express and spontaneous consent, and by that of the Church of our realm.

“VI. By these presents we renew, approve, and confirm the liberties, franchises, immunities, prerogatives, rights, privileges, granted by the Kings our predecessors of pious memory, and by ourselves to all churches, monasteries, holy places, religious men and ecclesiastics in our realm.”

This Edict appeared either during the last year of Clement IV., when the Pope absolutely depended on the protection of Charles of Anjou against the reviving Ghibellinism under Conradin, and he might be reduced to take refuge under the tutelage of Louis; or during the vacancy in the Pontificate. In either case it would have been dangerous, injurious, it would have been resented by the common voice of Christendom, if the acts of Louis had been arraigned, or even protested against as impious aggressions on the rights of Rome. The Edict itself was profoundly religious, even submissive in its tone; at all events, the assertion of the supremacy, of the ultimate right of judgment in the temporal power, was very different coming from Louis of France than from Frederick II., or any of his race. Louis was almost Pope in the public mind; his piety, his munificence, his devotion to the Crusade, in which he was again about to embark, his profound deference in general to the clergy and to the Pope himself, which had almost already arrayed him in worshipped sanctity, either allayed the jealousy of the Roman See, or made it imprudent to betray such jealousy. Hence it was

that neither at the time of its publication, nor subsequently, did it provoke any counter protestation; it had already taken its place among the Ordinances of the realm, before its latent powers were discovered, denounced, condemned. Then, seized on by the Parliaments, defended, interpreted, extended by the legists, strengthened by the memorable decree of the *Appeal against abuses*, it became the barrier against which the encroachments of the ecclesiastical power were destined to break; nor was it swept away till a stronger barrier had arisen in the unlimited power of the French crown.

During this vacancy in the Pontificate, St. Louis Aug. 25, 1270. closed his holy life in the most ignoble, and Death of St. Louis. not the least disastrous of the crusades, into Africa. It was the last, except the one desperate (in some degree brilliant) struggle, which was even now about to take place under our Prince Edward, for the narrow remnant of the Holy Land. Again the beauty of the passive virtues of Louis, his death, with all the submissive quietness of a martyr, blinded mankind to his utter incompetency to conduct a great army, and to the waste of noble blood; the Saint in life assumed in the estimation of mankind the crown of martyrdom.¹ Nothing was wanting but his canonization; and canonization could add no reverence to the name of St. Louis.

Year after year had passed, and still the stubborn fifteen Cardinals persisted in their feud; still Papacy still vacant. Christendom was without a Pontiff; and might discover (at least the dangerous question might arise) the fatal secret that a supreme Pontiff was not

¹ Joinville. Tillemont has collected all the striking circumstances of the death of St. Louis. — Vol. v. p. 169.

necessary to Christendom. They withstood the bitter mockery of one of their brethren, the Bishop of Porto, that it were well to remove the roof of their chamber, that the Holy Ghost might descend upon them. The Franciscans seem to have been astonished that the virtues and learning of the pride of their order, St. Bonaventura, did not command the general homage. They fabled, at least the annalist of the Church declares it a fable, that Bonaventura would not condescend to the proffered dignity.¹ At length the Cardinals determined to delegate to six of their members the full power of the conclave.

The wisdom or felicity of their choice might, if ever, justify the belief in a superior overruling Gregory X. counsel. It fell upon one, towards whom it is difficult to conceive how their thoughts were directed, a man neither Cardinal nor Prelate, of no higher rank than Archdeacon of Liège, and dispossessed of his Archdeaconry by the unjust jealousy of his bishop; upon one now absent in the Holy Land on a pilgrimage. Gregory X., such was the name he assumed, was of a noble house, the Visconti of Piacenza, but having early left his country, was not committed to either of the great Italian factions: he was unembarrassed with family ties; he was an Italian, but not a Roman, not therefore an object of jealousy and hatred to rival houses among that fierce baronage. He had been a canon of Lyons, but was by no means implicated with French interests. One great religious passion possessed his soul: the Holy Land, with its afflictions and disasters, its ineffaceable sanctity, had sunk into the depth of his affections; the interests of that land were his highest

¹ Raynald. sub ann.

duties. It was to this end that Gregory X. devoted himself with all the energy of a commanding mind, or rather to a preparatory object, perhaps greater, at all events indispensable to that end. It was in order to organize a Crusade, more powerful than any former Crusade, that he aspired to pacify, that he succeeded for a time in pacifying, Western Christendom. This greatest of pontifical acts, but this alone, Gregory X. was permitted to achieve.

The reception of this comparatively obscure ecclesi-
Inauguration. astic, thus suddenly raised to the chair of St.
Jan. 21, 1272. Peter, might encourage his most holy hopes. He landed at Brundisium, was escorted by King Charles to Capua, and from thence, passing by Rome, to Viterbo, where the Cardinals met him with reverential unanimity. He was crowned at Rome with an elaborate ceremonial, published by himself as
March 27, 1272. the future code, according to which the Roman Pontiffs were to be elected, inaugurated, invested: the most minute particulars of dress were arranged, and the whole course of processional service.¹ Gregory X. took up his residence at Orvieto.

Gregory had hardly ascended the Pontifical throne,
Determines when he determined to hold a great Ecumenic
on a Council. Council. That it might be a Council worthy of the title, he summoned it for two years later. The pacification of Christendom was the immediate, the reconquest of the Holy Land the remote, object of this

¹ The Jews were to offer, as a regular part of the ceremony, their congratulations, and to present the book of the Old Testament. The Pope was seated on the *Sedes Stercoraria*, emblematic of the verse in the Psalm "*de stercore erigit pauperem.*" This is noticed on account of misapprehensions sometimes prevalent on this singular usage. See on the *Sedes Stercoraria*, Mabillon, *Iter Italicum*, p. 59.

great diet of Christendom. The place of the Council was debated with grave prudence. Within the Alps it was more convenient, perhaps it was more dignified, for the Pope to receive the vassal hierarchy; but beyond the Alps alone was there hope of reawakening the slumbering enthusiasm for the sepulchre of the Saviour. Lyons was the chosen city. Gregory in the mean time labored assiduously at the great work which was to be consummated in the Council — the pacification of Christendom. Three measures were necessary: I. The extinction of the wars and feuds in Italy. II. The restoration of the Empire, in the person of a great German Prince. III. The acknowledgment of the Greek Emperor of Constantinople, and the admission of that Emperor into the league of Christian princes; with the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches.

Gregory began his work of pacification in Lombardy: he did not at once withdraw himself from the head of the Guelfic confederacy; he still asserted the power of Charles of Anjou as Vicar of the Empire; he even confirmed the excommunication against the Ghibelline cities, Pisa, Pavia, Verona, and the Duke of Tyrol: nor did he take up the cause of Otho Visconti, the exiled Ghibelline Archbishop of Milan, against the della Torres, who held that city.¹ But he began gradually to feel his strength. He negotiated peace between Genoa and Venice, A.D. 1273. rivals for the mastery of the sea; between Venice and Bologna, rivals for the command of the navigation of the Po. Pisa was reconciled to the Church; the archiepiscopal dignity restored to the city. In Florence, on his way to the Council, Gregory at-

¹ Annal. Mediolanen. Muratori, Ann., sub ann. 1272.

tempted to awe into peace the Guelfs and Ghibellines. The Guelfs heard this strange doctrine applied to their enemies, "They are Ghibellines, it is true, but they are citizens, men, Christians."¹ He made the two factions, both at Florence and Sienna, swear to a treaty of peace, and to the readmission of the exiles on both sides, in his own presence and in that of Charles of Anjou, and Baldwin of Constantinople. But the hatred of Guelf and Ghibelline was too deeply rooted; Charles of Anjou openly approving the treaty, secretly contrived a rupture; the Ghibellines were menaced with assassination: the Pope paused on his journey to cast back an excommunication on the forsworn and disobedient Florence. Nor would Genoa enter into terms of reconciliation with Charles of Anjou. Yet on the whole there was at least a surface of quiet; though under the smouldering ashes lay everywhere the fires, nursing their strength, and ready to burst out again in new fury.

Richard, Earl of Cornwall, died, having squandered April 2. 1272. his enormous wealth for the barren honor of bearing the imperial title of King of the Romans for fourteen years, and of displaying in London the splendor and majesty of his imperial pomp.² Notwithstanding the claim of Alfonso of Castile, who had exercised no other right than sending a few troops into Lombardy, the Pope commanded a new election. Perhaps he already anticipated the choice of Rodolph of Hapsburg, the founder of the great house of Austria.

¹ S. Antonin. ii. tit. 20, s. 2.

² The Germans soon saw, according to Paris, the contempt in which England held Richard of Cornwall; and withdrew, ashamed of their Emperor. He passed as much time in England as in Germany. — Matt. Paris, pp. 953-4.

The Pope confirmed the choice ; he tried all means of soothing the pride ; he used the gentlest, most Sept. 29, 1273. courteous persuasions, but he paid no regard to the remonstrances of the King of Castile. Rodolph of Hapsburg, whose great activity and abilities had been already displayed in the internal affairs of Germany, who had commanded the suffrages of all the electors, except the hostile Ottocar, King of Bohemia,¹ was the sovereign whose accession any Pope, especially Gregory X., might hail with satisfaction. He seemed designated as the chief who might unite Christendom in the Holy War.² He had none of the fatal hereditary claims to possessions in Italy, or to the throne of Naples. In the north of Italy he might curb the insatiate ambition, the restless encroachments of Charles of Anjou : the Pope exacted his promise from Rodolph that he would not assail Charles in his kingdom of Sicily or in Tuscany. Gregory X. aspired to include within the pale of the great Christian confederacy, to embark in the common crusade, even a more useful ally, the Greek Emperor of Constantinople. A Greek was again Emperor of the East ; Michael Palæologus ruled in Constantinople ; Baldwin II., the last of the Latin emperors, was an exile in Europe. Instead of espousing his cause, or

¹ The electors were, Wernher of Eppstein, Archbishop of Mentz ; Henry of Fustingen, Archbishop of Treves ; Engelbert of Falkenstein, Archbishop of Cologne ; Louis, Palatine of the Rhine and Duke of Bavaria ; John, Duke of Saxony ; John, Margrave of Brandenburg. According to some authorities, Ottocar, King of Bohemia, declined the crown. The reader will find a fair popular account of the elevation of Rodolph of Hapsburg in Coxe's House of Austria.

² Rodolph was besieging the Bishop of Basle when he received the intelligence of his election. The city at once surrendered to the King of the Romans. The Bishop was furious. "Sit firm," he cried, "O Lord God, or Rodolph will occupy thy throne." "Sede fortiter, Domine Deus, vel locum Rudolfus occupabit tuum." — Albert Argentan. p. 100.

encouraging the ambition of Charles of Anjou, who A.D. 1272. had married his daughter to the heir of Baldwin, and aspired to the dominion of the East in the name of his son-in-law, Gregory embraced the wiser and bolder policy of acknowledging the title of the Greek. Palæologus consented to pay the great price of this acknowledgment, no less than submission to the Papal supremacy, and the union of the Greek with the Latin Church.¹ Palæologus had no great reason for profound attachment to the Greek clergy. The Patriarch Arsenius, with boldness unusual in the Eastern hierarchy had solemnly excommunicated the Emperor for his crime in cruelly blinding the young John Lascaris, in whose name he held the empire. Arsenius had been banished on a charge of treason; a new patriarch sat on the throne, but a powerful faction of the clergy were still Arsenites. On his death, they compelled the burial of the banished prelate in the sanctuary of Santa Sophia; absolution in his name alone reconciled the Emperor to God. Palæologus, though the ruling Patriarch was more submissive, might not be disinclined to admit larger authority in a more remote power, held by a Pope in Italy rather than a Patriarch in Constantinople. By every act, by bribery, intimidation, by skilfully softening off the points of difference, and urging the undoubted blessings of union, he wrung a slow consent from the leading clergy of the East: they were gradually taught to consider that the procession of the Holy Ghost, from the Father and the Son, was not a doctrine of such repulsive heterodoxy, and to admit a kind of vague

¹ Pachymer, ii. 15: iii. 1, 2; v. 10; p. 369, &c. Nicephorus Gregoras, iii. 1; iv. 1. Gibbon, edit. Milman, xi. 313, *et seq.*

supremacy in the Pope, which the Emperor assured them would not endanger their independence, as dear to him as to themselves.¹ Ambassadors arrived at Rome with splendid offerings for the altar of St. Peter, and with the treaty of union and of submission to the Roman see, signed by the Emperor, his son, thirty-five archbishops and metropolitans, with their suffragan synods. The Council of Lyons witnessed with joy this reunion — a reunion unhappily but of few years — of the Church of Basil, the Gregories, and Chrysostoms, with that of Leo and Gregory the Great.

Nothing could contrast more strongly than the first and second Councils of Lyons. The first was summoned by Innocent IV., attended by hardly one hundred and fifty prelates, to represent the whole clergy of Christendom; its aim to perpetuate a desperate war, and to commit the Empire and the Papacy in implacable hostility; its authority disclaimed by the larger part of Christendom, cordially and fully accepted by scarcely one of the great kingdoms. At the second Council of Lyons, Gregory X. took his seat at the head of five hundred bishops, seventy abbots, and at least a thousand dignified ecclesiastics. Every kingdom of the West acknowledged its ecumenic power.

¹ Pachymer complains, not without bitterness, that the Latins called the Greeks, in their contempt, "white Hagarenes." Προσίστατο γὰρ τὸ σκάνδαλον, καὶ τὸ λευκοὺς Ἀγαρηνοὺς εἶναι Γραικοὺς παρ' ἐκείνοις μείζον ἤρετο. — Lib. v. p. 367, edit. Bonn. The Greek clergy were secretly determined to maintain their independence, to acknowledge no primacy, and not to subject themselves to the judgment of traitors and low men. I presume they thought all Italians like the Genoese of Pera, merchants. Ἀλλὰ μένειν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῇ κυρία τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἡγούμενοι, καθὼς καὶ ἀρχήθεν εἶχε, καὶ μὴ παρὰ καπήλων κινδυνεύειν κρίνεσθαι καὶ βαναύσων. — p. 368. Strange collision of Greek and Roman pride! The sovereign did not like the φεριοί, who were very busy.

The King of Arragon was present; the Latin patriarchs of Constantinople and of Antioch, fourteen cardinals, ambassadors from Germany, France, England, Sicily, the Master of the Templars, with many knights of St. John. Of the two great theologic luminaries of the age, the Dominican Thomas Aquinas and the Franciscan Bonaventura, Thomas died on his way to the Council:¹ Bonaventura was present, preached during its sittings, but died before its dissolution. The Council of Lyons aspired to establish peace throughout Christendom; the recognition of an Emperor, elected with the full approval, under the closest bonds of union with the Pope; the readmission of the Eastern Empire, and of the Greek Church, within the pale of Western Christendom. Such was the function of this great assembly, perhaps the first and last Council which was undisturbed by dispute, and uttered no sentence of interdict or excommunication. The declared objects for which the Council was summoned were succor to the Holy Land, the reconciliation of the Greek Church, the reformation of manners. The session opened with great solemnity. The Pope himself officiated in the religious ceremonial, assisted by his cardinals. For the first object, the succor to the Holy Land, a tenth of all ecclesiastical revenues was voted for six years. The

¹ Dante has given perpetuity to the charge against Charles of Anjou of having poisoned St. Thomas; adduced also by Villani, ix. 218: —

“ Carlo venne in Italia, e per ammenda
Vittima fè di Corradino, e poi
Respinse al ciel Tommaso per ammenda.”

Purgat. xx. 67.

Compare commentary of Benvenuto da Imola (apud Muratori). The Guelf Villani assigns as a motive the fear that St. Thomas (a Neapolitan), the oracle of Christendom, would expose his cruelty and wickedness. It is probably an invention of the profound Neapolitan hatred.

Council, as it awaited the arrival of the Greek ambassadors, occupied itself on regulations concerning the discipline and morals of the clergy. On the 24th June arrived the ambassadors. After the edict of the Emperor of Byzantium, sealed with a golden seal, had been exhibited and read, the act for the union of the two Churches was solemnly passed; the Pope himself intoned the *Te Deum* with tears of joy; the Latin clergy chanted the creed in Latin; the Greek, those of the embassy, assisted by the Calabrese bishops, chanted it in Greek. As they came to the words, "who proceedeth from the Father and the Son," they repeated it, with more emphatic solemnity, three times. The representative of the Eastern Emperor acknowledged in ample terms (such were his secret instructions) the supremacy of St. Peter's successor.

Gregory X. did not permit this Council to be dissolved until he had secured the Papacy from the scandals which had preceded his own election; but to the stern law with which he endeavored to bind the cardinals, he found strong opposition. It was only by his personal authority with each single prelate, that he extorted their irrevocable signature and seal to the statute which was to regulate the proceedings of the conclave on the death of a Pope. The statute retained to the cardinals the proud prerogative of sole election; but it ordained that only ten days after the death of the Pope they were to be shut up, without waiting for absent members of the college, in a single chamber in the deceased Pope's palace, where they were to live in common; all access was to be strictly prohibited, as well as writing or message: each was to have but one domestic; their meals were to be

received through a window too narrow to admit a man. Any communication with them was inhibited under the menace of interdict. If they agreed not in three days, their repast was to be limited, for five days, to a single dish ; after that only bread and wine ; so they were to be starved into unanimity. If the Pope died out of Rome, in that city where he died was to be this imprisonment of the conclave, under the municipal magistrates, who were sworn to allow the liberty permitted by statute, but no more. All offenders against this decree, of whatever rank, were at once excommunicate, infamous, and could rise to no dignity or public office ; any fief or estate they might hold of the Church of Rome, or any other Church, was forfeit. All former pacts, conventions, or agreements, were declared null and void ; if under oath, the oath was abrogated, annulled. In every city in Christendom public prayers were to be offered up to God to infuse concord, speedy and wise decision, into the hearts of that venerable conclave.¹ So closed the second Council of Lyons. One act of severity alone, the degradation of Gregory's old enemy, the Bishop of Liège, appears in the annals of this Council. The Christian world was, on the other hand, highly edified by the appearance and solemn baptism of certain Tartars.

Gregory X., after an interview with the King of Oct. 18, 1275. Castile at Beaucaire, whom he strove to reconcile to the loss of the Empire, and an interview with the Emperor Rodolph at Lausanne, repassed the Alps. He was received with deserved honors ; only into excommunicated Florence — excommunicated, no one could deny, with perfect Christian justice — the

¹ Mansi et Labbe, sub ann.

peaceful prelate refused to enter. The world was anxiously awaiting the issue of these sage and holy counsels; the pontificate of peace, peace only to be broken by the discomfiture of the infidels in the East, was expanding, it was to be hoped, into many happy and glorious years. Suddenly Gregory sickened on his road to Arezzo; he died, and with him Jan. 10, 1276. broke up the whole confederation of Christendom. The world again, from the conclave to the remotest limits not of Europe alone, but of Christianity, became one vast feud. With Gregory X. expired the Crusades; Christianity lost this principle of union, the Pope this principle of command, this title to the exaction of tribute from the vassal world. From this time he began to sink into an Italian prince, or into the servant of one of the great monarchies of Europe. The last convulsive effort of the Popedom for the dominion of the world, under Boniface VIII., ended in the disastrous death of that Pope; the captivity of the Papacy at Avignon.

After the death of Gregory X., in hardly more than three years three successive Popes rose and passed like shadows over the throne of St. Peter, and a fourth commenced his short reign. The popular superstition and the popular hatred, which, unallayed by the short-lived dignity, holiness, and wisdom of Gregory X., lay so deep in the public mind, beheld in these deaths which followed each other in such darkening rapidity, either the judicial hand of God or the crime of man. The Popes were no sooner proclaimed than dead, either, it was believed, smitten for men's sins or their own, or cut off by poison.¹

Rapid succession of Popes.

Innocent V. 1276.

¹ "Papæ quatuor mortui, duo divino judicio, et duo veneno exhausti."
—Chron. Foro Livien. Muratori, S. I. xxii.

The first of these, Peter of Tarantaise (Innocent V.), was elected in January, took up his residence in Rome, and died in June. Ottobuoni Fieschi, the nephew of Innocent IV., answered his kindred, who crowded around him with congratulations on his election, "Would that ye came to a cardinal in good health, not to a dying Pope." He just lived to take the name of Hadrian V., to release his native Genoa from interdict, and to suspend with his dying breath the constitution of Gregory X. concerning the Conclave. He was not crowned, consecrated, or even ordained priest. Hadrian V. died at Viterbo.

Hadrian V.
Elected
July 9, died
Aug. 18.

The immediate choice of the cardinals now fell on John XXI. Pedro Juliani, a Portuguese, the Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum. Though the cardinals had already obtained from the dying Hadrian the suspension of the severely restrictive edict of Gregory X. concerning the Conclave, the edict was popular abroad. There were many, and among them prelates who declared that, excepting under that statute, and in conformity with its regulations, the cardinals had no right to the sole election of the Pope.¹ There was a great uproar in Viterbo, instigated by these prelates. The Archbishop of Corinth, with some other ecclesiastics who were sent forth to read the suspension of the edict by Hadrian V., confirmed by John XXI., the new Pope, was maltreated; yet, even if the ceremonial was not rigidly observed, there had been the utmost speed in the election of John XXI. The Pope was a man

¹ "In tantam prorupere temeritatis insaniam, ut in dubium auctoritatem et jurisdictionem collegii ejusdem Ecclesiæ revocarent, et de illis in derogationem ipsarum disputantes utilibet, enervare immo et evacuare pro viribus niterentur inanibus argumentis." — Rescript. Joann. XXI., apud Raynald. 1276.

of letters, and even of science ; he had published some mathematical treatises which excited the astonishment and therefore the suspicion of his age. He was a churchman of easy access, conversed freely with humbler men, if men of letters, and was therefore accused of lowering the dignity of the Pontificate. He was perhaps hasty and unguarded in his language, but he had a more inexpiable fault. He had no love for monks or friars : it was supposed that he meditated some severe coercive edicts on these brotherhoods. Hence his death (he was crushed by the falling of the roof in a noble chamber which he had built in the palace of Viterbo) was foreshown by gloomy prodigies, and held either to be a divine judgment, or a direct act of the Evil One. John XXI. was contemplating with too great pride the work of his own hands, and burst out into laughter ; at that instant the avenging roof came down on his head. Two visions revealed to different holy men the Evil One ^{May 15 (?)} _{20? 1277.}

hewing down the supports, and so overwhelming the reprobate Pontiff. He was said by others to have been, at the moment of his death, in the act of writing a book full of the most deadly heresies, or practising the arts of magic.¹

For six weeks, the Cardinals, released from the coercive statute, met in conclave without coming to any conclusion. At length the election ^{Nov. 25,} _{1277.} fell on John Gaetano, of the noble Roman ^{Nicolas III. il} _{comperto.} house, the Orsini, a man of remarkable beauty of person and demeanor. His name, "the Accomplished," implied that in him met all the graces of the handsom-

¹ Ptolem. Luc. xxvi. Nangis, however, says that he died "perceptis omnibus sacramentis ecclesiasticis." — Sub ann. 1277. Siffred. in Chronic.

est clerks in the world ; but he was a man likewise of irreproachable morals, of vast ambition, and of great ability. This age of short-lived Popes was the age of magnificent designs as short-lived as their authors. The nobler, more comprehensive, more disinterested scheme of Gregory X. had sunk into nothing at his death ; that of Nicolas III. had deeper root, but came not to maturity during his reign, or in his line. An Italian, a Roman, was again upon the throne of St. Peter. The Orsini at first took up his residence at Rome. He built a splendid palace, the Vatican, near St. Peter's, with gardens around, and fortified with a strong wall.¹ He repaired, enlarged, and strengthened the Lateran Palace. Unlike his rash predecessor, he was a friend to the great monastic orders : he knew how completely the preachers and other mendicants still, notwithstanding the hatred of the clergy, now they had taken possession of the high places of theology, ruled the public mind. To Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventura the world looked up as to its guiding lights ; nor had they lost their power over the popular passions.

Nicolas III. did not in any degree relax the Papal superintendence over Christendom to its extreme limits : he is interfering in the affairs of Poland and Hungary, mediating in the wars between France and Spain, watching over the crumbling wreck of the Christian possessions in the Holy Land. In the East he not merely held the justly alarmed Emperor, Michael Palæologus, to his plighted fidelity and allegiance, but insisted on the more ample recognition of the Papal supremacy.² He demanded that a solemn oath of sub-

¹ Bunsen und Platner, *Roms Beschreibung*, ii. p. 231.

² Raynald. sub ann. 1279, 80. Pachymer (vi. 10, p. 461) calls the Pope

ordination should be taken by the Patriarch and the clergy. To the prudent request of the Emperor, that the obnoxious words which asserted the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, should not be forced at once into the creed, he returned a haughty reply that no indulgence could be granted, though some toleration might be conceded for a time on the other points in which the Greek differed from the Roman ritual. He even required that the Greek Church should humbly seek absolution for the sin of their long schism. A strong faction broke out in the Empire, in Constantinople, in the Court, in the family of the Emperor. They branded the Pope, the Patriarch, the Emperor, as heretics. Palæologus became that most odious of persecutors, a persecutor without the excuse of religious bigotry; confiscation, scourging, mutilation, punished the refractory assertors of the independence of the Greek Church. The Pope's Legates were gratified by the sight of four princes of the blood confined in a loathsome prison. But discontent led to insurrection. The Prince of Trebisonde, who had always retained the title of Emperor, espoused the cause of Greek orthodoxy. His generals betrayed the unhappy Palæologus: his family, especially his nieces, intrigued against him. He hesitated; for his hesitation he was excommunicated at Rome by Martin IV., the slave of his enemy Charles of Anjou. On his death the Greeks with one consent threw off the yoke; the churches were purified from the infection of the Latin rites; the creed resumed its old form; Andronicus, the

Return of
the Greek
Church to in-
dependence.

υρβανος. The Jesuit Possin, Chronol. in Pachymerum, conjectures *Ουρσινος* the Orsini — perhaps a blunder of the Greeks. The whole long intrigue may be traced through two or three books of Pachymer.

son of Palæologus, refused burial to his schismatic father.¹

But Italy was the scene of the great achievements, it was to be that of the still greater designs, of Nicolas III. The Emperor Rodolph was not yet so firmly seated on his throne (he was involved in a perilous war with Ottocar of Bohemia) as to disdain the aid of the Roman Pontiff. He could not but look to the resumption at least of some imperial rights in Lombardy; if the Pope should maintain the cause of Charles of Anjou, Italy was entirely lost. From the magnificence, the policy, or the fears of Rodolph, the Pope extorted the absolute cession to the Roman See, not only of Romagna, but of the exarchate of Ravenna. The Chancellor of the Emperor had exacted an oath of allegiance from the cities of Bologna, Imola, Faenza, Forlì, Cesena, Ravenna, Rimini, Urbino, and May 29, 1278. some other towns. Rodolph disclaimed the acts of his Chancellor, recognized the donation of the Emperor Louis, and made a new donation, in his own name, of the whole territory from Radicofani to Ceperano, the March of Ancona, the duchy of Spoleto, the county of Bertinoro, the lands of the Countess Matilda, the exarchate of Ravenna, the Pentapolis, Ferrara, Comachio, Montefeltro, and Massa Trabaria, absolutely; and with all his full rights to the See of St. Peter. The Pope obtained a confirmatory acknowledgment of his sovereignty, as well as over Sardinia, Corsica, and Sicily, from the great electors of the Empire.² This document is signed by the Archbishop of Salzburg and other prelates, by the Chancellor of the Empire, by Albert the eldest, and

¹ Raynald. 1279. ii.

² Raynald. p. 473.

Hartman the second son of the Emperor, by many of the nobles with their own hand, by some with Feb. 14, 1279. that of their notaries.¹ This cession Nicolas determined should not be, as it had heretofore been, an idle form in the officers of the Empire; and the Legates of the Pope presented themselves at the gates of the greater cities, demanding the acknowledgment of the Papal sovereignty. The independent principalities, the republics which had grown up in these territories, made no resistance; they were released from their oath to the Emperor, and took the oath to the Pope; even Bologna submitted on certain terms. The Pope was actual ruling sovereign of the whole of the dominions to which the Papal See had advanced its pretensions.² The extent of this sovereignty was still vague and undefined: the princes maintained their principalities, the republics their municipal institutions and self-government. They admitted no rulers appointed by the Pope; his power of levying taxes was certainly not unrestricted, nor the popular rule absolutely abrogated. Thus strong in the manifest favor of the Emperor Rodolph, Nicolas III. made a great merit to Charles of Anjou that he had stipulated that the Emperor should abstain from all warlike operations against Charles. The ambitious Frenchman overawed, quietly Sept. 16 in the following year. allowed himself to be despoiled first of his vicariate of Tuscany, and then of his senatorship of Rome. Charles humbly entreated that he Schemes of Charles of Anjou. might not suffer the indignity of surrendering

¹ Boehmer observes of this document, that the two sons of the Emperor could write: the Burgrave of Nuremburg and the Archbishop of Salzburg! could not. — *Regesta*, p. 98.

² “Ma quello, che i cherici prendono, tardi sanno rendere.” — Villani, vii. 53.

that office, which, on the expulsion of Henry of Castile, had been regranted to him for ten years by Pope Clement IV., before the expiration of that term, now almost elapsed. Nicolas condescended to grant his humble petition; but on the abdication of Charles he passed a rigorous edict that the senatorship from that time should never be held by emperor, king, prince, marquis, duke, count, or baron, or any man of great rank or power, or even by their brother, son, or grandson; no one could hold it for above a year; no one without special license of the Apostolic See.¹ This hostility to Charles may have been the deliberate policy of the Pope: it was said that the Pope had demanded the niece of Charles in marriage for his nephew; Charles contemptuously answered, the Pope was no hereditary prince, and that notwithstanding the red shoes he wore, he must not presume to mix his blood with that of kings.² There can be no doubt that Charles had used his influence in the conclave to oppose the elevation of the Roman Orsini.

Charles retired to his dominions to brood over revenge, to meditate a league against the Eastern Empire which was to compensate for his losses in the West. The Popes had taken the reconciled Greeks, the submissive Palæologus (the fear of Charles had been a chief motive for the religious tractableness of the Greeks³), under their protection. Gregory X. had refused to sanction or to consecrate the banner which Charles was prepared to unfold in the name of the

¹ Nicolai III., Regesta. Raynald. sub ann.

² Ricordano Malespina, 204. Villani, vii. 53.

³ This appears throughout the Byzantine accounts.

Latin Philip; Charles had been seen to gnaw his ivory sceptre in wrath, in the antechamber of the Pope, at this desertion of what he asserted to be the cause of legitimate right and orthodox belief.¹ Charles was now negotiating with the Latins of the Eastern Empire and the republic of Venice to take arms and replace the son of Baldwin on the throne of Constantinople. Even in Sicily Charles of Anjou was not absolutely secure: the Pope was understood to entertain secret relations with the enemies of the French rule.

But Nicolas III. had ulterior schemes, which seem to foreshow and anticipate the magnificent designs of later nepotism. Already, under ^{Nepotism of} Nicolas III. pretence of heresy, he had confiscated the castles of some of the nobles of Romagna, that particularly of Suriano, and invested his nephews with them. The castle of St. Angelo, separated from the Church, was granted to his nephew Orso. His kinsmen were by various means elected the Podestàs of many cities. Three of his brethren, four more of his kindred, had been advanced to the Cardinalate. Bertoldo Orsini, his brother, was created Count of Romagna. His favorite nephew, by his sister's side, Latino Malebranca (a Brancaleone), the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, a powerful preacher, had great success in allaying the feuds in many of the cities,² even in Bologna, wearied by the long strife of the Lambertazzi and the Gieromei; wherever the Cardinal established peace, the Count of Romagna assumed authority. Himself he had declared perpetual Senator of Rome. His nephew Orso was his vicar in this great office. But these were but the first

¹ Pachymer, v. 26, p. 410.

² Villani, ii. c. 55. Villani calls Bertoldo Orsini nepote of Nicolas III.

steps to the throne which Nicolas III. aspired to raise for the house of Orsini. It was believed that he had laid before the Emperor Rodolph a plan by which the Empire was to become hereditary in his house, the kingdom of Vienna was to be in Charles Martel, nephew of Charles of Anjou, the son-in-law of the Emperor. Italy was to be divided into the two kingdoms of Insubria and Tuscany, besides that of Sicily; and on these thrones were to be placed two of the house of Orsini.¹

A sudden fit of apoplexy at his castle of Soriano cut Aug. 22, 1280. short all these splendid designs.² From this Death of favorite residence he had dated his Bulls, a practice which had given great offence. The Pope was, as it were, merging himself in the stately Italian sovereign.

Charles of Anjou heard with the utmost joy the un-
The conclave at Viterbo. expected tidings of the death of his enemy Nicolas III. He instantly took measures to secure himself against the calamity of a second hostile Pope, to wrest the Pontificate from the aspiring family of the Orsini, and form an independent Italian interest.³ The family of the Annibaldeschi rivalled that of the Orsini in wealth and power. There was a rising in Rome; the divided people had recourse to the vain step

¹ Muratori, *Annal. sub ann. 1280*, with authorities.

² Nicolas is in Dante's hell for his unmeasured nepotism: —

“ Sappi che io fui vestito del gran manto;
E veramente fui figliuol del Orsa,
Cupido sì per avansar l' Orsatti,
Che su l' havere, e qui mi misi in borsa.”

Inferno, xix. 66.

“ Però ti sta; chè tu sei ben punito,
E guarda ben la mal tolta moneta,
Ch' esser ti fece contra Carlo ardito.” — 95.

³ Villani, vii. c. 57.

for the preservation of peace, the creation of two Senators, one out of each of the rival houses. This, as might have been expected, increased the confusion; Rome became a scene of strife, murder, anarchy. But Viterbo, where the conclave of Cardinals was assembled, was even of more importance, an Annibaldeschi was Lord of that city.¹ The people of Viterbo were won, by force or bribery, to the party of Charles. The constitution of Gregory X. was utterly forgotten; the conclave prolonged its sittings. The Pope had crowded the college with Orsinis and their dependants. The Viterbans surrounded the chamber; they accused the Orsini Cardinals as disturbing or arresting the freedom of election, dragged forth two of them, and cast them into prison. With them they seized and incarcerated Malebranca the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia: the rest were kept on the statutable bread and wine; the French Cardinals, it was said, were furtively provided with better viands. Yet the strife endured for nearly six months before the stubborn conclave would yield to the election of the Cardinal of Santa Cecilia, a Frenchman, the slave and passive instrument of Charles of Anjou.

Martin IV. was born at Mont Pencè in Brie; he had been Canon of Tours. He put on at Martin IV. first the show of maintaining the lofty character of the Churchman. He excommunicated the Viterbans for their sacrilegious maltreatment of the Cardinals; Rinaldo Annibaldeschi, the Lord of Viterbo, was compelled to ask pardon on his knees of the Cardinal Rosso, and forgiven only at the intervention of the Pope.² Martin IV. retired to Orvieto.

¹ Muratori, sub ann. 1281.

² Ptolem. Luc. xxiv. 2.

But the Frenchman soon began to predominate over the Pontiff; he sunk into the vassal of Charles of Anjou. The great policy of his predecessor, to assuage the feuds of Guelf and Ghibelline, was an Italian policy; it was altogether abandoned. The Ghibellines in every city were menaced or smitten with excommunication; the Lambertazzi were driven from Bologna. Forlì was placed under interdict for harboring the exiles; the goods of the citizens were confiscated for the benefit of the Pope. Bertoldo Orsini was deposed from the Countship of Romagna; the office was bestowed on John of Appia, with instructions everywhere to coerce or to chastise the refractory Ghibellines.¹ The Pope himself was elected Senator of Rome, in defiance of the decree of Nicolas III.; Charles of Anjou was his vicegerent. Nor did excommunication confine itself to Italy; Charles was now in a state to carry on his league for the subjugation of the Eastern Empire, in conjunction with the exiled Latin Sovereign and the Venetian republic. Palæologus, who had surrendered the liberties of the Greek Church to the supremacy of Rome, who, at the command of the Pope, had persecuted, had provoked his subjects, his kindred to rebellion, had raised up a rival Greek Patriarch to contest Constantinople, who had been denounced as worse than a heretic, as an apostate, was now, because something was yet thought wanting to his base compliance, or rather because he maintained his throne in defiance of Charles of Anjou, solemnly excommunicated by Martin IV.² The last hope of union between

¹ "Che votò l'erario delle smuniche per fulminar tutti i Ghibellini, e chiunque era nemico o poco amico del medesimo Re Carlo." So writes the calm Muratori, p. 185.

² This passionate and partial excommunication shocked his own age.

the Churches was thus cut away by the Pope's suicidal hand ; Palæologus died repudiated as a renegade by his own Church, under the interdict of the Church of Rome. His son Andronicus, as has been said, dissolved the inauspicious alliance ; and the Churches were again for above two centuries in implacable oppugnancy.

Charles of Anjou, with the Pope as his obsequious minister, might seem reinstated in more than his former plenitude of power ; he resided with the Pope at Orvieto, as it were to dictate his counsels. Though Martin did not yet venture to dispossess the Emperor Rodolph of the Vicariate of Tuscany, Charles might have been justified in the noblest hopes of his ambition in Italy, but he was looking with more wide-grasping predilection to the East. Under the pretext of a Crusade to the Holy Land, he was aspiring to add Constantinople to his realm.

From the date of this act, writes Ptolemy of Lucca, all went wrong with Charles and the Church. See back, p. 137.

CHAPTER V.

SICILIAN VESPER.

BUT a mine had long been working under his throne, which in the next year burst with all the suddenness and terror of one of his kingdom's volcanoes. While he contemplated the sovereignty of the East, Sicily was lost to his house. Around one man has gathered all the glory of this signal revolution; John of Procida has been handed down as almost the sole author of the expulsion of the French, and the translation of the crown of Sicily to the house of Arragon: Peter of Arragon, the Emperor Palæologus, Nicolas III., the revolted Barons of Sicily were but instruments wielded by his strong will, brought into close alliance through negotiations conducted by him alone; excited, sustained, guided by his ubiquitous presence. Even the Vespers of Palermo were attributed to his secret instigation. John of Procida perhaps achieved not all which is ascribed to him alone; in the vast system of secret agency he was not the sole mover; much which was traced to his suggestion arose out of natural passions, resentment, revenge, ambition, interest, patriotism, love of power and glory in those who conspired to this memorable work. A fatal revelation, but too trustworthy, shows John of Procida in his early career (he had been already physi-

cian to Frederick II. and to Conrad, and confidential counsellor of Manfred) as basely abandoning the cause of the fallen Manfred, crouching at the feet of the Pope at Viterbo, protesting that he had only bowed beneath the storm of Manfred's tyranny; he was commended to the mercy of Charles of Anjou by the Pope, as his beloved son, as the future faithful servant of King Charles. How far he was admitted to favor appears not, but three years after he is involved in a charge of high-treason, and flies from Naples. But however base instead of noble, revenge, disappointed treachery and ambition, are hardly less strong and obstinate motives to action than generous indignation at tyranny, and holy love of country.¹

In all the conspiracy, a conspiracy of thoughts, feelings, passions, if not of compacts and treaties, the most fatal to Charles was the insupportable, unexampled, acknowledged tyranny of the French dominion.² Sicily had groaned and bled under the cruel despotism of the Emperor Henry; the German rudeness aggravated the harshness of his rule. Frederick II., as also his son, had been severe, though just; if his fiscal regulations were oppressive, they were repaid by the brilliancy of his court, by his wise laws, by noble foundations, by the national pride in beholding Naples and Sicily the most civilized kingdom in the world. Charles and his French and Provençal nobles, with the haughtiness and cruelty of foreign rulers, indulged without restraint those outrages which gall to

¹ See the document among the *Pièces justificatives* in Cherrier, iv. 524, from a copy in the Royal Library at Paris. Compare Amari's preface and document first edit. iv., Florence, 1851; St. Priest, *Histoire de la Conquête de Naples*, Paris, 1847.

² "Sub tyrannicæ turbine tempestatis."

madness. Charles from the first treated the realm as a conquered land ; after the insurrection in favor of Conradin, as a revolted kingdom. The insurgents, or reputed insurgents, were hunted down, torn from their families : happy if only put to a violent death !¹ to the exactions of Charles there were no limits. The great fiefs seized, confiscated on the slightest suspicion of disaffection, were granted to French nobles ; the foreign soldiers lived at free quarters ; they were executioners commissioned to punish a rebellious race. To all complaints of cruelty, outrage, extortion, Charles replied with a haughty scoff, as though it were fit treatment for the impious rebels against himself and the Pope. The laws, severe enough before, were aggravated by still more sanguinary enactments, and by their execution with refined mercilessness. But there were worse cruelties than these ; those women only were safe who, being heiresses, were compelled to marry French nobles ; of these there was a regular register ; of all others the honor was at the mercy of those who in this respect knew no mercy : there was no redress, no pity ; it might seem as if Sicilian women were thought honored by being defiled by French and Provençal brutality.² Over this tyranny, which himself had inflicted on this beautiful land, Clement IV. had groaned in bitter remorse. Charles in his impartial rapacity spared not the property of the Church ; if in his cruelty he respected the sacred persons of ecclesiastics, he taxed even the Templars and Knights of St. John. The

¹ Amari, c. iii., for a full account of these horrors, with his authorities.

² See these enactments, quoted in Amari. On the forced marriages, p. 61. His fourth chapter we read with a revulsive shudder, and would fain disbelieve ; but the industry of Amari has been too searching, his facts and documents are too strong even for charitable palliation.

Pope had sent remonstrances, embassies, to warn, to threaten, but in vain.¹ He had entreated the intervention of the holy Louis. Gregory X. menaced that for the tyrannies of the same kind which Charles exercised in Tuscany the wrath of God would fall on such a tyrant. "I know not," answered Charles, "what that word tyrant means; this I know, that so far I have been protected by God; I doubt not that he will still protect me." The Archbishop of Capua denounced him at the Council of Lyons; he laughed to scorn the complaints of the Prelates, the Legates of the Council, the letters of the Pope to Philip of France. In Sicily all the abuses of the government were felt in their extreme weight. Naples was the residence of the court, and derived some glory or advantage from its splendor; Palermo sunk to a provincial town, Sicily to a province. The Parliament had fallen into desuetude; it was an iron reign of force without justice, without law, without humanity, without mercy, without regard to morality, without consideration of any one of the rights, or of the interests or the welfare of mankind.

The race of Sicily's old kings was not utterly extinct. In Constance, the daughter of Manfred, the ^{House of} wife of Peter of Arragon, lingered the last ^{Arragon.} drops of Swabian blood: it was said that on the scaffold Conradin had cast down his glove, to be borne to the King of Arragon, as the heir of his rights, the avenger of his death. To the court of the King of Arragon had fled those Sicilians of the Swabian party who had the good fortune to become exiles — among these three of great name, Roger Loria, Conrad Lan-

¹ See two letters especially, in Raynaldus, 1267; also in Martene and Durand, *Thes. Nov. Anecd.* ii. 530, 537, &c.

cia, John of Procida. John of Procida was an exile soon after the failure and death of Conradin. His hatred to the French is said to have been deepened by the worst outrage, perpetrated on his wife and his daughter. Existing grants to his wife Landolfina intimate that she was under the protection of some powerful influence, not improbably of a French paramour.¹ John of Procida was born at Salerno; though a noble, he was profoundly skilled, as in other learning, in the science of his native city, that of medicine. He rose in the favor of Peter of Arragon, became his bosom counsellor, was endowed with lands, the lands of Luxen, Benezzano, and Palma, in the kingdom of Valencia; he was a Valencian noble.²

Peter of Arragon. council, thus occupied by Sicilian exiles, who were constantly urging upon him the odious tyranny of Charles the usurper, and the discontent, disaffection, despair of the Sicilians; with his Queen not likely to forget her own hereditary claims, or the wrongs of her noble father Manfred and his ancient house; lord but of his own narrow kingdom hardly won from the Moors, and held, as it were, in a joint sovereignty with his Nobles, was not likely to avert his eyes from the prospect of a greater monarchy which expanded before him. He had made treaties of peace with the rival Kings his neighbors, a treaty for five years with the King of Granada, a league with Castile; and over King Sancho of Castile he held the menace of letting loose the two young princes, nearer to the throne than Sancho, and resident at the court of

¹ Amari, note, p. 82.

² See Amari's note, p. 83.

Arragon.¹ He kept up friendly relations with Philip of France, the husband of his sister; he even made advances to Charles of Anjou; there was a proposal of marriage between his son and the daughter of Charles. Peter was embarked in suspicious negotiations with the Saracens in Tunis.² At the same time he was making great preparations for war; in his arsenals in Valencia, Tortosa, and Barcelona was gathering a powerful fleet; his subjects granted subsidies; provisions, stores, arms, accoutrements of war were accumulated as for some momentous design. How far John of Procida instigated these designs, or only encouraged the profound ambition of the King for dominion, of the Queen for revenge for her injured house, none can know: nor how far Procida acted from his own intense patriotism or revenge, or but as an instrument in the hand of others.

There can be no doubt that there was a secret understanding, that there was direct communication between the enemies of Charles, the Emperor of the East, Pope Nicolas III., the King of Arragon, perhaps the Sicilian nobles, Alaimo da Lentini and his colleagues: John of Procida may have been, no doubt was, one of Procida. the chief of those agents;³ if not actually commissioned, tacitly recognized. He was once, if not twice,

¹ Montaner, c. 40, 45; in Buchon, Collection des Mémoires, D'Esclot, c. 75.

² Amari, p. 86, with his notes.

³ Amari is inclined to treat as romance this primary organization of the whole confederacy by John of Procida; his ubiquitous agency; his disguises; especially his frequent intercourse with the Sicilian nobles. But there seems a great difficulty as to the growth of this romance, and this elevation of Procida into the sole hero of the war and the great deliverer, after his apostasy from the cause of Arragon, and after he had incurred the hatred of the Arragonese party.

at the court of Constantinople. There he needed not to rouse the fears and jealousy of Palæologus; the designs of Charles against the Eastern Empire were, if not avowed, but half disguised. Charles was the open ally of Philip, the Latin claimant of the Empire. Palæologus might well enter into correspondence, or admit to a secret interview, the bosom counsellor of King Peter of Arragon. To Procida Palæologus may have intrusted his secret offers of large sums of money for the Pope, the hundred thousand byzantines, not to detach him from the interests of Charles of Anjou, against whom he had already taken hostile measures, but to enable him to defy the power of the Angevine.¹ Procida, according to the common account—an account contradicted only by the silence of other writers—left Constantinople, pretending to be driven away by the Emperor; he disguised himself as a Mendicant Friar, reached Malta, landed in Sicily, had frequent interviews with the disaffected nobles, Walter of Caltagirone, Palmerio Abbate, Alaimo da Lentini. From them he obtained an invitation to Peter of Arragon to advance his claims to the inheritance of his wife. In the friar's garb he made his way to Nicolas III. in Soriano, revealed himself to the Holy Father, explained the extent, the success of his negotiations; laid the treasures of Palæologus at his feet. Nicolas consented to recognize the claims of Peter of Arragon, and by letters of the most profound secrecy promised him the investiture of the realm. Procida appeared at Barce-

¹ "E guarda ben la mal tolta moneta,
Ch' esser ti fece contra Carlo ardito."

Dante, *Inf.* xix. 98.

Amari's new interpretation of this verse is to me quite unsatisfactory.

lona with these animating tidings to rekindle the somewhat slumbering ambition of the King. The warlike preparations were urged with greater activity. Procida set forth on a second mission: he landed at Pisa; at Viterbo he saw the Pope; at Trapani conferred with the Sicilian nobles; passed to Negropont undiscovered, reached Constantinople. He was welcomed by the Emperor; negotiations were commenced for an alliance by marriage between the courts of Arragon and Constantinople. Accardo, a Lombard knight, was secretly despatched by the Emperor to the court of Peter with thirty thousand ounces of gold. Procida embarked on board a ship of Pisa, Accardo was concealed in the ship. At Malta they met the Sicilian conspirators, with the news of the death of Nicolas III. The Sicilians would have abandoned the hopeless enterprise; Procida reinvigorated them by the introduction of Accardo, and the sight of the Byzantine gold. All Procida's eloquence, all his ability, it is said, but very improbably, was needed to dissuade the King of Arragon from the abandonment of the hopeless enterprise. Again the plan was fully organized; the manner, the time of the insurrection arranged.¹

It is certain that the warlike preparations of the King of Arragon had not escaped the jealous observation of Charles of Anjou; he could not but know the claims, the wrongs, of the Queen of Peter of Arragon; the stern, reserved, ambitious character of Peter; perhaps he had obtained some clue to the great league which was secretly forming against him. The vague rumors industriously propagated of designs against the

¹ The sons of Manfred were living, but in prison, from whence they never came forth.

Saracens of Africa by Peter of Arragon, however at other times they might have justified vast and secret armaments, could not blind the Angevine's keen apprehensions. Charles had himself demanded explanations. Among the first acts of Martin IV. was to require, through Philip of France, and from Peter himself directly, the scope and object of these menacing preparations: if they were against the infidels, he offered his sanction, his prayers, his contributions. Peter baffled his inquiries with his dexterous but inflexible reply. He implored the prayers of the Pope on his design; "but if he thought his right hand knew his secret, he would cut it off, lest it should betray it to his left."

Charles, on his part, had been making great preparations; he had a large fleet in the ports of Sicily and Naples; a powerful land force was assembled for embarkation. He had increased the burdens of the kingdom to provide this army, compelled the Sicilian nobles to furnish vessels; and he was as little disposed to disclose his own secret objects as the King of Arragon. The ostensible object was the deliverance of the Holy Land; the immediate one the subjugation of the Greek Empire. These forces were still in the garrisons and towns of Sicily. Forty-two castles had been built, either in the strongest positions, or to command the great cities, and were held by French feudatories. They were provided with arms, and could summon at an instant's notice all their French sub-feudatories, or the Sicilians on whom they could depend for aid. Heribert of Orleans, the King's Lieutenant, was in Messina; in Palermo, John di San Remi, the Justiciary of the Val di Mazzara.

At this juncture the crisis was precipitated by one of those events which no sagacity could have foreseen,¹ which all the ubiquitous activity ^{Sicilian Vespers.} ascribed to John of Procida could not have devised — an outburst of popular fury excited by one of those acts of insulting tyranny which goad an oppressed people to madness. The insurrection of Palermo received the darkly famous name of the “ Sicilian Vespers.”

The Sicilians still crowded to their religious festivals with all the gayety and light-heartedness of a southern people. Even their churches, where they assembled for the worship of that God whose representative on earth had handed them over to their ruthless tyrant, where alone they found consolation under the grinding tyranny, were not secure against the all-present agents of that tyranny. The officers of the revenue watched the doors of the churches: as all who had not paid their taxes went in or came forth, even from within the sanctuary itself they dragged off their miserable victims, whom they branded with the name of heretics — “ Pay, ye Paterins, pay ! ”

It was at a festival on Easter Tuesday that a multitude of the inhabitants of Palermo and the ^{March 31.} neighborhood had thronged to a church, about half a mile out of the town, dedicated to the Holy Ghost. The religious service was over, the merriment begun; tables were spread, the amusements of all sorts, games, dances under the trees, were going gayly on; when

¹ Amari, c. v. p. 89. “ Da trame coi Ghibellini e con alcuni Baroni di Napoli o di Sicilia non si possono ormai revocare in dubbio. Falsa è che la pratica, sì strettamente condotta, fosse a punto riuscita a produrre lo scoppio del Vespro.” I fully subscribe to this latter clause.

the harmony was suddenly interrupted, and the joyousness chilled by the appearance of a body of French soldiery, under the pretext of keeping the peace. The French mingled familiarly with the people, paid court, not in the most respectful manner, to the women; the young men made sullen remonstrances, and told them to go their way. The Frenchmen began to draw together. "These rebellious Paterins must have arms, or they would not venture on such insolence." They began to search some of them for arms. The two parties were already glaring at each other in angry hostility. At that moment the beautiful daughter of Roger Mastrangelo, a maiden of exquisite loveliness and modesty, with her bridegroom, approached the church. A Frenchman, named Drouet, either in wantonness or insult, came up to her, and under the pretence of searching for arms, thrust his hand into her bosom. The girl fainted in her bridegroom's arms. He uttered in his agony the fatal cry, "Death to the French!" A youth rushed forward, stabbed Drouet to the heart with his own sword, was himself struck down. The cry, the shriek, ran through the crowd, "Death to the French!" Many Sicilians fell, but of two hundred on the spot, not one Frenchman escaped. The cry spread to the city: Mastrangelo took the lead; every house was stormed, every hole and corner searched; their dress, their speech, their persons, their manners denounced the French. The palace was forced; the Justiciary, being luckily wounded in the face, and rolled in the dust, and so undetected, mounted a horse, and fled with two followers. Two thousand French were slain. They denied them decent burial, heaped them together in a great pit. The horrors of the scene

were indescribable : the insurgents broke into the convents, the churches. The friars, especial objects of hatred, were massacred ; they slew the French monks, the French priests. Neither old age, nor sex, nor infancy, was spared ; it is a charge more than once repeated in the Papal acts, that they ripped up Sicilian women who were pregnant by Frenchmen, in order to exterminate the hated brood. A government was hastily formed ; Roger Mastrangelo, Arrigo Barresi, Niccoloso d'Ortoleva (knights), with Niccolo de Ebde-moniam were summoned by acclamation to be Captains of the people. They then proclaimed the " Good estate and liberty," unfolded the banner of the city, an eagle on a field of gold ; the keys of the Church were still quartered upon it.

The Justiciary was pursued to Vicari, thirty miles distant ; the people rose at the cry of " Death ^{Insurrection} to the French ! " ^{general.} ¹ The garrison at first re-
fused to capitulate, and to be sent safe to Provence ; it was now too late, the Justiciary was shot down by a random arrow, every Frenchman massacred. Sicily was everywhere in arms ; Corleone first followed the example of Palermo. Everywhere the French were hunted down and murdered. One man alone was spared. William Porcelet, Governor of Calatafimi, who had ruled with justice and humanity, was, by common consent, sent safe on board ship by the Palermitans, and returned to Provence. In Messina was the strength of the French force, under the Viceroy, Heribert of Orleans. Messina rose. Heribert was

¹ Muoian le Francese ! In this account I am quite with Amari against Mon de St. Priest, who cannot forget to be a Frenchman. — See Amari's authorities, p. 103, and Appendix.

compelled to submit to terms; he swore to transport himself and all his soldiers to Aigues Mortes, in Provence. He broke his oath, and landed in Calabria; the Messinese revenged his perjury on every Frenchman who was left behind. In one month, that of April, Sicily was free; the French had disappeared.

Such was the revolution which bears in history the appalling name of the Sicilian Vespers, sudden, popular, reckless, sanguinary, so as to appear the unpremeditated explosion of a people goaded to frenzy by intolerable oppression; yet general, simultaneous, orderly, so as to imply, if not some previous organization, some slow and secret preparation of the public mind. John of Procida, the barons in league with John of Procida, appear not during the first outburst; the fleets of Peter of Arragon are yet within their harbors. The towns take the lead; they assert their own independence, and form a league for mutual defence. Acts are dated as under the rule of the Church and the Republic. The Church is everywhere respected; it might seem as if the Sicilians supposed Nicolas III. still on the Pontifical throne, or that they would not believe that the Pope was so servile an adherent of the Angevine. They were soon disabused. When

Conduct of
Charles of
Anjou.

Charles first heard of the revolt, of the total loss of Sicily, and the massacre of at least two thousand Frenchmen, he lifted his eyes to Heaven in devout prayer: "O Lord God, if it hath pleased thee to visit me with adverse fortune, grant at least that it may come with gentle steps."¹ As though he had satisfied his religion by this one stern act of humility, no sooner had he reached Naples than he burst into the most fu-

¹ Villani, vii. 71.

rious paroxysms of wrath. Now he sat silent, glaring fiercely around him, gnawing the top of his sceptre; then broke forth into the most horrible vows of vengeance: "if he could live a thousand years, he would go on razing the cities, burning the lands, torturing the rebellious slaves. He would leave Sicily a blasted, barren, uninhabited rock, as a warning to the present age, an example to the future." Pope Martin, less violent in his demeanor, was hardly less so in his public acts. The Palermitans sent an embassy declaring their humble submission to the Papal See. The messengers were monks. They addressed the Pope — "O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us!" Martin compared them to the Jews, who smote the Saviour, and cried "Hail, King of the Jews."¹ His bull of excommunication describes in the blackest terms the horrors of the massacre.² A crusade was proclaimed against the Sicilians: all ecclesiastics, archbishops, bishops, abbots, who favored the insurgents, were at once deprived and deposed; all laymen stripped of their fiefs or estates. The people of Palermo sternly replied, that "they had unfolded the banner of St. Peter, in hopes, under that protection, to obtain their liberties; they must now unfold the banner of another Peter, the King of Arragon."³

Charles made the most vigorous preparations for war. The age and state of public mind are singularly illustrated by the following story: a ^{The Mendicant Friar.} Mendicant Friar, Bartolomeo Piazza, appeared in his

¹ Villani, vii. 62.

² Saba Malesspina. The Bull in Raynald. sub ann. 1282.

³ Compare Amari, Documento x.; a long oration, assuredly made after the time.

camp, a man of blameless morals and some learning; he disdained the disguise of a spy. He was led before the King. "How darest thou," Charles abruptly accosted him, "come from that land of traitors?" "Neither am I a traitor, nor come I from a land of traitors. I come, urged by religion and conscience, to warn my holy brethren that they follow not your unjust arms. You have abandoned the people committed by God to your charge to be torn by wolves and hounds; you have hardened your heart against complaints and supplications; they have avenged their wrongs, they will defend, they will die for, their holiest rights. Think of Pharaoh!" Either awe, or the notion that Bartolomeo would bear back a true account of his overwhelming forces, induced the King to endure this affront; the Friar returned to Messina.¹

Before Messina appeared Charles with all his army, burning for revenge. At first he obtained Charles before Messina. some successes; but the popular leader, Manfredone, was deposed, the Noble Alaimo da Lentini placed at the head of the garrison. The resistance became obstinate. The women were most active, as perhaps most exposed to the vengeance of the French. Their delicate hands bore stones, ammunition; they tended the sick and wounded.² The Legate of the Pope, the Cardinal Gerard, accompanied the King; he was armed with the amplest powers. He demanded, or was invited

¹ Bartolom. de Neocastro, cap. 32, 34.

² "Deh com' egli è gran pietate,
Delle donne de Messina,
Veggendole scapigliate,
Portando pretia e calcina.
Iddio gli dia briga e travaglia,
A chi Messina vuol questar."

Popular song, quoted by Villani, vii. 77.

to enter the city. He was received with general jubilation, and escorted to the Cathedral; Alaimo da Lentini laid at his feet the keys of the city and his own staff of command. They entreated him to accept the dominion of the city in the name of the Church, to appoint a governor: "to the Church they would willingly pay their tribute, but away with the French! in the name of God let them be driven from the lands of the Church!" Gerard replied, if not in the fierce and criminary tone ascribed to him by one historian as to insolent rebels, yet with a haughty condescension.¹ "Heinous as were their sins, they were not beyond the mercy of their mother the Church; he would reconcile the Messinese to their King; subjects must not speak of terms to their sovereign. Let them trust the magnanimity, the clemency of Charles; the savage murderers alone would meet with condign punishment. Let Messina lay herself in the lap of the Church; in her name to be restored to King Charles." "To Charles! Never!" shouted Alaimo; he seized his staff from the hand of the astonished Prelate. "To the French, never! so long as we have blood to shed and swords to wield." The whole people took up the cry; Gerard made one more effort: thirty citizens were appointed to treat with the Legate; but all was vain. They knew too well the mercy of Charles. "O, candid counsel of the Church to lay our necks down before the headsman! We are sold to the French; we must ransom ourselves by arms. We offer to the Pope the sovereignty of the land; Martin declines it. Instead of being the mild and gentle Vicar of Christ, he is but the tool of the French. Go tell the Angevine tyrant

¹ Neocastro, Villani, Malespina, &c.

that lions and foxes shall never more enter into Messina."

In the mean time, the fleets of Peter of Arragon were upon the seas ; still disguising his aim, as if he designed to make war only on the Saracens of Africa, he landed his forces on the coast of Tunis. He appeared as the ally of the Prince of Constantina. He disembarked in the Port of Collo : he had some vigorous engagements with the Saracens.¹ He despatched ambassadors to Rome to implore the blessing of the Pope on his Crusade against the infidels, the protection of the Church for his dominions in Spain, the presence of a Legate, the right to levy the tenths for a war against the infidels. This specious embassy was received with specious civility by the Pope at Monte Fiascone.

The Parliament had met at Palermo ; it had been determined to offer the throne of Sicily to Peter. He received the ambassadors of the Sicilians with grave solemnity ; as offering to him unexpected, unsolicited honors. The Holy War was at an end ; Peter and his fleet in the port of Trapani. At Palermo he was saluted by acclamation King of Sicily. The relief of Messina was the first aim of the new King. He ordered a general levy of all who could bear arms : men crowded to his banner. To Charles he sent an embassy of the noble Catalonians, Pietro Queralto, Ruy Ximenes de Luna, William Aymeric, Justiciary of Barcelona. He demanded safe-conduct by two Carmelite Friars. In two days Charles declared that he would give them audience ; two days — during which he hoped to find

¹ Zurita.

himself master of Messina. But his terrific assault by sea and land was repelled ; instead of receiving the ambassadors of the King of Arragon as a haughty conqueror, he received them weary with toil, boiling with rage and baffled pride. He was seated on his bed, which was covered with rich silk drapery. He threw disdainfully aside on his pillow the letter of the King of Arragon : he awaited the address of the ambassador Queralto. Queralto's words were doubtless those of the letter, they ran thus : " The illustrious Peter, King, by the grace of God, of Arragon and Sicily, commands you, Charles, Count of Provence and King of Jerusalem, to depart from his kingdom ; to give him free passage into his city of Messina, which you are besieging by sea and land ; he is astonished at your presumption in impeding the passage of the King through his own dominions."¹ The ambassadors no doubt asserted the hereditary claim of the King of Arragon. Charles, with the gesture constantly ascribed to him, bit his sceptre in his wrath ; his reply had his usual pride, but, by one account, something of dejection. He told the ambassadors to survey his vast forces ; he expressed utter astonishment that the King of Arragon should presume to interfere between him and his rebellious subjects ; he held Naples and Sicily as a grant from the Pope ; but he intimated that he might withdraw his weary troops to refresh them in Calabria : it would only, however, be to return and wreak his vengeance on Sicily ; the Catalonian dominions of the King of Arragon would not be safe from his resentment.

From this period the mind of Charles, never strong,

¹ See, in Amari, the variations in the copies of this letter, p. 166, note.

but so insolent and tyrannical in prosperity, sank into a strange prostration, in which fits of an absurd chivalry alternated with utter abjectness. He would neither press vigorously, nor abandon the siege of Messina. Now he wreaked his vengeance on all the lands in his possession, burned churches and monasteries; now offered advantageous terms to the Sicilians; now endeavored openly to bribe Alaimo da Lentini, who cast back his offers with public scorn. At length, threatened by the fleets of Arragon, he withdrew to his continental dominions.

The climax of this strange state of mind was his challenge to the King of Arragon, to determine their quarrel by single combat. In vain the Pope denounced the impiety, and remonstrated against the wild impolicy of this feudal usage, now falling into desuetude. The King of Arragon leaped at the proposition, which he could so easily elude; and which left him full time to consolidate undisturbed his new kingdom, to invade Calabria, to cover the sea with his fleets. This defiance to mortal combat, this wager of battle, was an appeal, according to the wild justice of the age, to the God of Battles, who, it was an established popular belief, would declare himself on the righteous side. Charles of Anjou had the opportunity of publicly arraigning before Christendom his hated rival of disloyal treachery, of secret leaguings with his revolted subjects, of falsehood in his protestations of friendship. The King of Arragon stood forth on the broad ground of asserting his hereditary right, of appearing as the deliverer of a people most barbarously oppressed, as summoned to the crown by the barons and people of Sicily. He was almost admitted as possessing an equal

claim with him who had received the Papal investiture. The grave and serious manner in which the time, the place, the manner of holding those lists were discussed might seem to portend a tragic close; this great ordeal would be commended to still greater honor and acceptance by the strife of two monarchs for one of the noblest kingdoms of the earth, the kingdom of Naples. Italy itself offered no fair or secure field. The King of England, Edward I., was the one powerful and impartial monarch, who might preside as umpire; his Gascon territories, a neutral ground, on which might be waged this momentous combat. All proceeded with the most serious and solemn dignity, as if there could be no doubt that the challenge so given, so accepted, would come to direct and inevitable issue. Bordeaux was chosen as the scene of the kingly tournament. The lists were prepared at great cost and with great splendor. Each King proceeded to enroll the hundred knights who were to have the honor of joining in this glorious conflict with their monarch. The noblest and bravest chivalry of France offered themselves to Charles of Anjou; his brother, Philip the Hardy, offered to enter the lists with him. On the side of Peter of Arragon were the most valiant Spanish knights, men accustomed to joust with the Moor, to meet the champions of the Crescent from Cordova or Granada. A Moorish Prince presented himself; if God gave the victory to Peter, not only would the Moor share the triumph, but submit to baptism in the name of the Christian's God. The Pope was over-The Pope endeavors in vain to prohibit the battle. borne; the Church had pronounced its condemnation on judicial combats. Martin had condemned

this on general grounds,¹ on the special objection, that it was setting on the issue of arms that which had already been solemnly adjudged by the supreme Pontiff; it was to call in question the Pope's right of granting the kingdom of Naples. He commanded Charles to desist from the humiliating comparison of himself and his heaven-sanctioned claims, with those of a presumptuous adventurer, of one already under the censure, under the excommunication of the Roman See; he offered to absolve the King from all his oaths: yet even on this point the Pope was compelled to yield his reluctant consent to the imperious will of his master.

The wrath of the Pope on the first intelligence of the insurrection, still more at the invasion of the realm by Peter of Arragon, had been hardly less violent than that of Charles of Anjou. At Orvieto he proclaimed more than the excommunication, the degradation of Peter. He denounced again the crime of the Palermitans in the massacre of the French; the impious rebellion of the realm of Sicily; he boasted the mild attempts of the Church, especially through Cardinal Gerard in Messina, to reconcile them to their lawful Sovereign. "Since Peter, King of Arragon, under the false color of an expedition to Africa, has invaded the island of Sicily — the peculiar territory of the Roman Church — with horse and foot; has set up the claim of his wife, the daughter of the accursed Manfred, to the throne; has

His censure
on the King
of Arragon.
March 21,
1283.

¹ Martin writes to King Edward of England that he had power "impediendi tam detestanda tam nociva." — MS., B. M., vol. xiv. Orvieto, April 15, 1284.

usurped the name of King of Sicily;¹ has openly countenanced the Messinese as he before secretly instigated the Palermitans to rebellion against their Sovereign: he has incurred the severest penalties, of usurpation, sedition, and violence. His crime is aggravated by the relation of the crown of Arragon to the See of Rome. That crown was granted by the Pope; his grandfather, Peter of Arragon, received it from the Pope, and swore fealty in his own name and in that of his successors to the successor of St. Peter. The King was now not only in rebellion; he had practised an impious fraud on his holy Father; he had implored the aid of the Pope, his blessing on his army, as though designed against the African barbarians. For these reasons not only was Peter adjudged a lawless usurper of the realm of Sicily, but deposed from his kingdom of Arragon; his subjects were discharged from all their oaths of fealty. His kingdom was to be seized and occupied by any Catholic Sovereign, who should be duly commissioned to that end by the Pope. The Cardinal of St. Cecilia was sent into France to offer the forfeited throne of Arragon to any one of the King's sons who would undertake the conquest: the only provision was the exclusion of the heir of the French throne: the two kingdoms could not be united under the same Sovereign. The subjugated realm was to be held of Pope Martin and his successors in the Apostolic See. The forfeiture comprehended the whole dominions of Peter, the kingdom

¹ The Pope seems here to charge Peter of Arragon with being the prime mover of the rebellion. "*Sicque non solum Panormitanos eosdem, quos alias pluries ad hæc sollicitasse per nuncios dicebatur, in inchoatæ contra præfatum regem seditionis et rebellionis contumaciâ obfirmavit,*" &c., &c. — Raynald. 1283, xix.

of Arragon, the kingdom of Valencia, Catalonia, and Barcelona.

The wager of battle between the Kings, which maintained its solemn dignity up almost to the appointed time, ended in a pitiful comedy, in which Charles of Anjou had the ignominy of practising base and disloyal designs against his adversary; Peter, that of eluding the contest by craft, justifiable only as his mistrust of his adversary was well or ill grounded, but much too cunning for a frank and generous knight. He had embarked with his knights for the South of France; he was cast back by tempests on the shores of Spain. He set off with some of his armed companions, crossed the Pyrenees undiscovered, appeared before the gates of Bordeaux, and summoned the English Seneschal. To him he proclaimed himself to be the King of Arragon, demanded to see the lists, rode down them in slow state, obtained an attestation that he had made his appearance within the covenanted time, and affixed his solemn protest against the palpable premeditated treachery of his rival, which made it unsafe for him to remain longer at Bordeaux. Charles, on his part, was furious that Peter had thus broken through the spider's web of his policy. He was in Bordeaux, when Peter appeared under the walls, and had challenged him in vain. Charles presented himself in full armor on the appointed day, summoned Peter to appear, proclaimed him a recreant and a dastardly craven, unworthy of the name of knight.

Pope Martin's enmity was as indefatigable as the ambition of Peter of Arragon. He strained his utmost power to break off a marriage proposed between Alfonso,

the elder son of Peter, with Eleanora, the daughter of Edward of England. He expostulated with Edward on the degradation of allying his illustrious house with that of an excommunicated prince; he inhibited the marriage as within the fourth degree of consanguinity. By enormous charges on the Papal treasury he bought off the Venetians from a treaty, which would have placed their fleet on the enemy's side.¹ He borrowed still larger sums on the security of the Papal revenues, above 28,393 ounces of gold: the tenths decreed by the Council of Lyons were awarded to this new Crusade. The annual payment of 8000 ounces of gold for the kingdom of Naples was postponed, on account of the inability of the Prince of Salerno to discharge the debt. Thrice in the following year, on A.D. 1283.

Holy Thursday, on Ascension Day, on the Dedication of St. Peter's church, the excommunication was promulgated at Orvieto, in Rome, in every city in Italy which would admit this display of Papal authority. The Cardinal Gerard, of St. Sabina, was commissioned to preach everywhere the Crusade: he might offer unlimited indulgences to all who would take up arms against Peter and the Sicilian rebels. The kingdom of Arragon, with the county of Barcelona and the kingdom of Valencia, were solemnly adjudged to Charles of Valois, the son of the King of France. Great forces were prepared in France to invade these Spanish realms of Peter. But in the mean time, Martin himself might tremble in his dominions. Guido of Montefeltro was in arms, hardly kept in check by John of Epps, the Papal General. At Rome were threatening

¹ Five thousand ounces of gold, which were likewise to hire and man twenty galleys for the fleet of Charles.

commotions ; the Pope endeavored to maintain his influence by the purchase of corn in great quantities in Apulia during a famine, its free or cheap distribution, and by other concessions. But the King of Arragon was not without his secret allies within the city.

Worse than this, Charles of Anjou returned to Italy ; he was met by the disastrous tidings of the utter destruction of his fleet by Roger Loria, and the capture of his son Charles, Prince of Salerno. This precious hostage was in the power of his enemies ; on him they might wreak their vengeance for the death of the young Conradin. Charles put on a haughty equanimity : “ I had rather have heard of his death than of his captivity.” He overwrought this proud endurance. He assembled the nobles ; he enjoined them to rejoice with him that he had lost a priest, who had only impeded the vigor and success of his arms.¹ He entered Naples, and declared it mercy that he impaled only one out of a hundred and fifty, who were suspected or accused of tampering with the victorious Arragonese.

But his arms were to be arrested by a mightier power. One fatal year was to witness the death of all the great personages engaged in this conflict ; it was to be bequeathed to a new generation of combatants. In the midst of his preparations for a more determined invasion of Sicily, Charles, exhausted by disappointment
June 7, 1206. and sorrow, died at Foggia : the Papal writers aver he made a most Christian end. Philip of France, after a doubtful campaign in Catalonia, for the conquest of the Spanish dominions of Peter of Arra-
Oct. 5. gon, in behalf of his brother, Charles of Va-

¹ Ptolem. Luc. xiv. 9. Compare throughout Raynaldus, and Muratori, *Annal. sub annis*, with their authorities.

lois, died at Perpignan: Peter of Arragon about a month later at Villa Franca di Penades. Al- Nov. 11. fonso, the elder son, quietly succeeded to his father's Arragonese crown; the infant James, according to his father's will, to that of Sicily. On the 29th of March before had died at Orvieto Pope Martin IV., who had emptied the whole armory of excommunication against the enemies of Charles of Anjou.¹ Such was the issue of all the interdicts, the anathemas, the crusades, and all the blood shed to determine the possession of the throne of Sicily.

There was now no commanding interest to contest the Pontificate. The Emperor Rodolph did not busy himself much in Italian politics. A Roman Prelate, John Boccamuzza, Archbishop of Monreale, Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum, resided as Legate in Germany; he presided over a Council at Wurtzburg, in the presence of the Emperor Rodolph. A chronicler of the times compares him with the Dragon in the Revelations, dragging his venomous tail (a host of corrupt Bishops) through Germany, which he contaminated with his simoniac perversity, amassing riches from all quarters, selling privileges, which he instantly revoked to sell them again, bartering with utter shamelessness the patrimony of the Crucified: he was insulted by the lofty German Prelates; he retired muttering vengeance.² In Italy the Angevine cause was paralyzed by the death of Charles, and the imprisonment of his son. The house of Arragon had no footing in the conclave. Under such circumstances the great families of Rome

¹ Muratori, sub ann. 1285.

² Gothofridus Esm. apud Boehmer, Fontes, ii. 111. Labbe, Concil. sub ann. 1286.

had usually some Prelate of sufficient weight and character, if parties among themselves were not too equally balanced, to advance to the highest eminence in the Church.

An Orsini had but now occupied the Papal throne, then a Savelli, and then a Pope of humble birth, enslaved by a nepotism of favor, not of blood, to the family of Colonna, followed in rapid succession. The Savelli, Honorius IV., was a man of great ability, a martyr to the gout. Almost his only important acts were the publication of two Edicts, matured under his predecessor Martin, which if issued and carried out under the Angevine reign in Naples and Sicily, might perhaps have averted the revolt. One was designed to propitiate the clergy of the realm: it asserted in the highest terms their independence, immunities, freedom of election, and other privileges. The second reënacted the laws, and professed to renew the policy of William the Good, the most popular monarch who had ever reigned in Sicily.¹ But they came too late. Sicily first under James, the second son of Peter of Arragon, afterwards, on the accession of James to the throne of Arragon, under Frederick, defied the Papal authority, and remained an independent kingdom. The captive Charles, now King of Naples, had framed a treaty for his own deliverance; he bought it at the price of his kingdom of Sicily and the city of Reggio. Although the Pope annulled the treaty which granted away the dominion of the Apostolic See, it was held to be of force by the contracting parties. This was the last act of Honorius IV.²

Honorius IV.
April 2, 1285.

James
crowned.
Feb. 2, 1286.

¹ Raynald. sub ann. Sept. 17.

² He died April 3, 1287.

months, they sat in strife: six of them died. The Cardinal Bishop of Præneste, by keeping a constant fire in his chamber, corrected the bad air, and maintained his vigor; the rest fled in fear. In February ^{Feb. 22, 1288.} they met again: their choice fell on the Car-^{Nicolas IV.}dinal of Præneste, the General of the Franciscan Order, the first of that Order who had ascended the Papal throne. The Bishop of Præneste, born, it is said, of lowly race, at Ascoli, owed his elevation to the Cardinalate to the Orsini, Nicolas III. In gratitude to his patron he took the name of Nicolas IV. His first promotion of Cardinals, though it seemed impartially distributed among the great local and religious interests, betrayed his inclinations. There was one Dominican, Matthew Acquasparta, the General of the Order; an Orsini, Napoleon; one of the house of Colonna, Peter; there was one already of that house in the Conclave, Jacobo Colonna. On the Colonnas were heaped all the wealth and honors; under their safeguard the Pope, who at first took up his residence at Reate, ventured to occupy the Papal palace at Rome.

The liberation of Charles the Lamé, the King of Naples, from his long captivity, was the great affair of Christendom. The mediation of Edward of England, allied with the houses of Arragon and of Anjou, and now the most powerful monarch in Europe, was employed to arrange the terms of some treaty which should restore him to freedom. The King of Arragon would not surrender his captive, still in prison in Catalonia, but at the price of the recognition of the Arragonese title to the kingdom of Sicily; Charles, weary of bondage, had already at Oleron acceded to this basis of the treaty.

By the treaty of Oleron,¹ Charles was to pay fifty July 15, 1287. thousand marks of silver. He pledged himself to arrange a peace in a manner satisfactory to the Kings of Arragon and of Sicily: in the mean time there was to be truce between the two realms, including Sicily. Charles was to obtain the ratification of the Pope, and the cession of Charles of Valois, who still claimed, as awarded by the Pope, the crown of Arragon; or at the close of that period he was to return into captivity. He was to surrender his three sons, and sixty Provençal Nobles and Barons, as hostages: the Seneschals of the fortresses in Provence were to take an oath that if the King did not terminate the peace or return into bondage, they were to surrender those fortresses to the King of Arragon. This treaty had been annulled first during the vacancy by the College of Cardinals, again at Reate by Nicolas IV. The King of England was urged to find some other means of releasing the royal captive. King Alfonso was forbidden to aid the cause of his brother James of Sicily; in that cause Alfonso himself had grown cool. A new treaty was framed at Campo Franco; it was written by a Papal notary. Charles was to pay at once twenty thousand marks (England lent ten thousand Oct. 20, 1288. marks); he was to give security for the rest. He was to pledge his word to the other conditions of the compact.² In this treaty there was a vague silence concerning the kingdom of Sicily: within one year Charles was bound to procure peace between France and Arragon: for this he left

Liberation of
Charles the
Lame.
Nov. 1288.

¹ The treaty and documents in Rymer, 1286-7.

² Rymer, p. 368 *et seq.* The whole progress of the negotiation is well and accurately traced by Amari, in a note to c. 13, p. 321.

his three sons as hostages; and solemnly swore that if this peace was not ratified, he would return to his prison. He obtained his freedom.

Nicolas IV. on his accession had not dared to take up his residence at Rome; Charles appeared before him at Reate. He was crowned, if not in direct violation of the words, of the whole spirit of the treaty, King of Naples and Sicily; for the whole of the dominions claimed by the house of Anjou he did homage and swore fealty to the Pope.¹ The Pope boldly and without scruple annulled the treaty written by his own notary, signed, executed without any protest on his part, by which Charles the Lamé had obtained his freedom. This decree of Nicolas was the most monstrous exercise of the absolving power which had ever been advanced in the face of Christendom: it struck at the root of all chivalrous honor, at the faith of all treaties. It declared in fact that no treaty was to be maintained with any one engaged in what the Holy See might pronounce an unjust war, that is a war contrary to her interests, a war such as that now waged between James of Arragon, as King of Sicily, and the crusading army of the son of Charles the Lamé. The war of the house of Arragon against the house of Anjou being originally unjust, no compact was binding. The kingdom of Naples, including Sicily having been granted by the Holy See as a fief, the title of Charles was indefeasible; himself had no power of surrendering it to another. It declared that all obligations entered into by a prince in captivity were null and void, even though oaths had been interchanged, and hostages given for their performance. Charles had no right to pledge the

¹ May 29 (Muratori), June 19 (Amari), 1289.

Roman See and the King of France, and the King of Arragon (Charles of Valois had assumed that title) to such terms. If Charles had sworn that should those Kings not accede to the treaty, he would return into captivity, the Pope replied that the imprisonment having been from the first unjust, Charles was not bound to return to it: his services being imperiously demanded as a vassal and special athlete for the defence of the Church, he was bound to fulfil that higher duty.¹ On these grounds Pope Nicolas IV. declared the King and his heirs altogether released from all obligations and all oaths. He went further; he prohibited Charles the lame from observing the conditions of the treaty, and surrendering his eldest son, according to the covenant, as one of the hostages. Nor was the Pope content with thus entirely abrogating the treaty; he anathematized King Alfonso for exacting, contrary to the commands of the Church, such hard terms; he ordered him, under pain of the highest ecclesiastical censure, to release Charles from all the conditions of the treaty; he even threatened the King of England with interdict, if, as guarantee of the treaty, he should enforce its forfeitures. But Charles the lame himself would not be content with the Papal absolution: he satisfied his chivalrous honor with a more miserable subterfuge. He suddenly appeared near the castle of Panicas, on the borders of Arragon, proclaimed that he was come in conformity to his oath to surrender himself into captivity. But as no one was there on the part of the King of Arragon to receive him, he

¹ "Nominatæ Ecclesiæ incommoda multa proveniant, dum ipse ejusdem ecclesiæ vassallus præcipuus, et specialis athleta ab illius per hoc defensione subtrahitur." — Bulla Nicolai IV. Compare Raynaldus, sub ann.

averred that he had kept his faith, and even demanded the restoration of the hostages and of the money left in pawn.

The war continued: James, not content with the occupation of Sicily, invaded Apulia; before Spring, 1289. Gaeta he suffered an ignominious failure. Charles, weakly, to the disgust of the Count of Artois and his other French followers who returned to France, agreed to a truce of two years. The death of his 1289-1291. brother Alfonso made James King of Arra- June 18, 1291. gon: he left his younger brother Frederick his Viceroy in Sicily. Frederick became afterwards the founder of the line of Arragonese Kings of the island.

Nicolas IV. closed his short Pontificate in disaster, shame, and unpopularity. He had in some Close of Crusades. respects held a lofty tone; he had declared the kingdom of Hungary a fief of the Holy See; and rebuked the Emperor Rodolph for causing his son, Albert, without the Pope's permission, to be chosen King of the Romans.¹ But the total loss of the last Christian possessions in the East, the surrender of Berytus, Tripoli, even at last Acre,² to the irresistible Sultan: the fatal and ignominious close of the Crusades, so great a source of Papal power and Papal influence, the disgrace which was supposed to have fallen on all Christendom, but with special weight upon its Head, bowed Nicolas down in shame and sorrow. The war between Edward of England and Philip of

¹ Raynald. sub ann.

² Read the siege of Acre (Ptolemaïs) in Michaud, iv. 458, *et seq.* Wilken, vii. p. 735, *et seq.* Acre fell, May 18, 1291. Michaud quotes the emphatic sentence of a Mussulman writer on this, it seems, final close of the Crusades: — "Les choses, s'il plaît à Dieu, resteront ainsi jusqu'au dernier jugement." — P. 487.

France, in which his mediation, his menace, were loftily rejected or courteously declined, destroyed all hopes of a new Crusade; that cry would no longer pacify ambitious and hostile Kings.

Nicolas had become enslaved to the Colonnas. No doubt under their powerful protection he had continued to reside in Rome.¹ They were associated in his munificence to the Churches. On the vault of S. Maria Maggiore, repaired at their common cost, appeared painted together the Pope and the Cardinal James Colonna. John Colonna was appointed Marquis of Ancona, Stephen Colonna Count of Romagna: this high office had been wrested from the Monaldeschi. Cesena, Rimini after some resistance, Imola, Forlì were in his power. In attempting to seize Ravenna he was himself surprised and taken prisoner by the sons of Guido di Polenta. But they were afterwards overawed by the vigorous measures of the Pontiff, urged by the Colonnas. Ildobrandino da Romagna, Bishop of Arezzo, was invested with the title of Count of Romagna; the subject cities leagued under his influence;² the sons of Polenta were compelled to pay three thousand florins of gold for their daring attack on the Pope's Count.³ The Romans seemed to enter into the favoritism of the Pope. James Colonna was created Senator; he was dragged, as in the guise of an Emperor, through the city, and saluted with the name of Cæsar; he gratified the Romans by marching at their head to the attack of

¹ Franciscus Pipon., S. R. I., t. ix.

² Muratori, sub annis 1290, 1291.

³ Rubeus, Chronic. Ravennat., Chronic. Parm., Chronic. Forliviens. S. R. I. xxii. .

Viterbo and other cities over which Rome, whenever occasion offered, aspired to extend her sovereignty.¹

There were acts in these terrible wars that raged in almost every part of Italy which might have grieved the heart of a wise and humane Pontiff more than the loss of the Holy Land. The mercy of Christendom might seem at a lower ebb than its valor. The Bishop of Arezzo, an Ubaldini, was killed in a battle against the Florentines; the Florentines slung an A.D. 1290. ass, with a mitre fastened on his head, into his beleaguered city.² The Marquis of Montferrat, the most powerful prince in northern Italy, was taken prisoner by the Alexandrians, shut up in an iron cage, in which he languished for nearly two years and died.³ Dante has impressed indelibly on the heart of man the imprisonment and death of the Pisan Ugolino (a man, it is true, of profound ambition and treachery) with that of his guiltless sons.

Nicolas is said to have died in sorrow and humiliation; he died accused by the Guelfs of April 4, 1292. unpapal Ghibellinism,⁴ perhaps because he was more sparing of his anathemas against the Ghibellines, and had consented, hardly indeed, but had consented to the peace between France and Arragon, Naples and Sicily: still more on account of his favor to the Colonnas,

¹ The play upon the name of Colonna, which Petrarch afterwards enshrined in his noble verse, had long occurred to the Saturnalian wit of Rome. In the frontispiece of a book, entitled "The Beginning of Evils," the Pope Nicolas IV. was represented as a column crowned by his own mitred head, and supported by two other columns. — Muratori.

² 1289. Villani, vii. c. 130. Muratori, sub ann.

³ Annal. Mediolanens. S. H. T. t. xvi.

⁴ Rodolph of Hapsburg, the Emperor, died July 15, 1291.

Ghibelline by descent and tradition, and hereafter to become more obstinately, furiously and fatally Ghibelline in their implacable feud with Boniface VIII.¹

¹ "Ma molto favoreggiò i Ghibellini." So writes the Guelf Villani, vii. c. 150.

CHAPTER VI.

CŒLESTINE V.

NICOLAS IV. died on the 4th of April, 1292. Only twelve Cardinals formed the Conclave. The Conclave. constitution of Gregory X. had been long suspended, and had fallen altogether into disuse. Six of these Cardinals were Romans, of these two Orsinis and two Colonnas; four Italians; two French.¹ Each of the

¹ The list in Ciacconius:—

Romans.

1. Latino Malebranca, a Franciscan, Cardinal of Ostia, the nephew of, and created by, Nicolas III.

2. John Buccamuzza, Cardinal of Tusculum (once Legate in Germany), created by Martin IV.

3. Jacobo Colonna, Cardinal of St. Maria in Viâ Latâ, created by Nicolas III.

4. Peter Colonna, Cardinal of St. Eustachio, created by Nicolas IV.

5. Napoleon Orsini, Cardinal of St. Hadrian, created by Nicolas IV.

6. Matteo Rosso (Rubeus), Cardinal of St. Maria in Porticu, created by Urban IV.

Italians.

7. Gerard Bianchi of Parma, Cardinal Sabinus, created by Honorius IV.

8. Matthew Acquasparta, Cardinal of Porto, created by Nicolas IV.

9. Peter Peregrusso, a Milanese, Cardinal of St. Mark, created by Nicolas IV.

10. Benedetto Gaetani of Anagni, Cardinal of St. Silvester (afterwards Boniface VIII.), created by Martin IV. He was dangerously ill, retired to his native Anagni, and recovered.

Frenchmen.

11. Hugh de Billiom, Cardinal of St. Sabina, created by Nicolas III.

12. Jean Cholet, Cardinal of St. Cecilia, died of fever in Rome, Aug. 2, 1292.

twelve might aspire to the supreme dignity. The Romans prevailed in numbers, but were among themselves more implacably hostile: on the one side stood the Orsinis, on the other the Colonnas.¹ Three times they met, in the palace of Nicolas IV., near S. Maria Maggiore, in that of Honorius IV. on the Aventine, and in S. Maria sopra Minerva.² The heats of June, and a dangerous fever (of which one, the Frenchman, Jean Cholet, died), drove them out of Rome; and Rome became such a scene of disorder, feud, and murder (the election of the Senator being left to the popular suffrage), that they dared not reassemble within the walls. Two rival Senators, an Orsini and a Colonna, were at the head of the two factions.³ Above a year had

Oct. 18, 1293.
St. Luke's
day.

elapsed, when the Conclave agreed to meet again at Perugia. The contest lasted eight months more. At one time the two Colonnas and John of Tusculum had nearly persuaded Hugh of Auvergne and Peter the Milanese to join them in electing a Roman, one of the Colonnas. The plan was discovered and thwarted by the Orsini, Matteo Rosso. The

¹ The proceedings of each member of the Conclave, during this interval, are described in the preface to the poem of the Cardinal St. George. — Muratori, v. p. 616. The Cardinal describes himself as being “*veluti præsens, videns, ministrans, palpans, et audiens, notusque Pontifici, quia Pontificibus carus.*” — P. 614.

² The Cardinal of St. George highly disapproved of the building of new palaces, by Honorius IV. on the Aventine, by Nicolas IV. near St. Maria Maggiore. It implied the desertion of the Lateran and the Vatican: —

“*nec utile mundo*
Exemplum, nam quisque suas (e?) ducet in altum
Ædes, et capitis Petri delubra relinquet,
Ac Lateranenses aulas, regalia dona,
Despiciet, gaudens proprios habitare penates.” — P. 621.

³ One of the Senators was Peter the son of Stephen, father of the author; the other, Otho de San Eustazio. — See Cardinal St. George.

Guelfic Orsini were devoted to the interests of Charles, the King of Naples; they labored to advance a prelate in the Angevine interest. The Colonnas, Ghibelline because the Orsini were Guelf, were more for themselves than for Ghibellinism. Charles of Naples came to Perugia, by his personal presence to over- In Perugia.awe the refractory members of the Conclave. The intrepid Benedict Gaetani, the future Boniface VIII., haughtily rebuked him for presuming to interfere with the office of the Holy Spirit. No one of the Cardinals would yield the post to his adversary, and expose himself to the vengeance of a successful rival; yet all seemed resolute to confine the nomination to their own body.

Suddenly a solitary monk was summoned from his cell, in the remote Abruzzi, to ascend the Pontifical throne. The Cardinal of Ostia, Latino Mal-^{Latino} Malebranca. ebranca, had admired the severe and ascetic virtues of Peter Morrone, a man of humble birth, but already, from his extraordinary austerities, held by the people as a man of the highest sanctity. He had retired from desert to desert, and still multitudes had tracked him out in vast swarms, some to wonder at, some to join his devout seclusion. He seemed to rival if not to outdo the famous anchorites of old. His dress was hair-cloth, with an iron cuirass; his food bread and water, with a few herbs on Sunday.

Peter Morrone has left an account of his own youth. The brothers of his Order, who took ^{Peter} his name, the Cœlestinians vouched for its ^{Morrone.} authenticity. His mother was devoutly ambitious that one of her eleven children should be dedicated to God. Many of them died, but Peter fulfilled her most ardent

desires. His infancy was marked with miracles. In his youth he had learned to read the Psalter; he then knew not the person of the Blessed Virgin, or of St. John. One day they descended bodily from a picture of the Crucifixion, stood before him, and sweetly chanted portions of the Psalter. At the age of twenty he went into the desert: visions of Angels were ever round him, sometimes showering roses over him. God showed him a great stone, under which he dug a hole, in which he could neither stand upright, nor stretch his limbs, and there he dwelt in all the luxury of self-torture among lizards, serpents, and toads. A bell in the heavens constantly sounded to summon him to prayers. He was offered a cock; he accepted the ill-omened gift; for his want of faith the bell was thenceforth silent. He was more sorely tried; beautiful women came and lay down by his side.¹ He was encircled by a crowd of followers, whom he had already formed into a kind of Order or Brotherhood; they were rude, illiterate peasants from the neighboring mountains.²

Either designedly or accidentally the Cardinal Malebranca spoke of the wonderful virtues of the hermit, Peter Morrone; the weary Conclave listened with interest. A few days after the Cardinal declared that a vision had been vouchsafed to a Holy Man, that if before All-Saints' Day they had not elected a Pope, the wrath of God would fall on them with some signal

¹ One vision is too coarse almost to allude to; but how are we to judge of the times or the men without their coarseness? The question was whether he should offer mass "post pollutionem nocturnam." The vision which sets his mind at rest is that of "aselli stercorandi" on the steps of a palace, that of the Holy Trinity. One of these awful persons is represented as pointing the moral of this foul imagination.

² "Non culta satis sed rustica turba
Montibus altisonis." — *Card. St. George.*

chastisement. "This, I presume," spake Benedetto Gaetani, "is one of the visions of your Peter Morrone." In truth it was; Malebranca had received a letter purporting to be in his hand. The Conclave was in that perplexed and exhausted state, when men seize desperately on any strange counsel to extricate themselves from their difficulty. Election of Coelestine V.

To some it might seem a voice from heaven. Others might shelter their own disappointment under the consolation that their rivals were equally disappointed: all might think it wise to elect a Pope without personal enmity to any one. It might be a winning hazard for each party, each interest, each Cardinal; the Hermit was open to be ruled, as ruled he would be, by any one. Malebranca saw the impression he had made; he pressed it in an eloquent speech. Peter Morrone was declared supreme Pontiff by unanimous acclamation.¹

The fatal sentence was hardly uttered when the brief unanimity ceased. Some of the cardinals began to repent or to be ashamed of their precipitate decree. No one of them (this they were hereafter to rue) would undertake the office of bearing the tidings of his elevation to the Pope. The deputation consisted of the Archbishop of Lyons, two Bishops, and two notaries of the Court.

The place of Morrone's retreat was a cave in a wild mountain above the pleasant valley of Sul- His retreat. mona. The ambassadors of the Conclave having achieved their journey from Perugia, with difficulty found guides to conduct them to the solitude. As they toiled up the rugged ascent, they were overtaken

¹ The Cardinal St. George describes the order and manner in which the Cardinals gave their accession to this vote — P. 617.

by the Cardinal Peter Colonna, who had followed them without commission from the rest, no doubt to watch their proceedings, and to take advantage of any opportunity to advance his own interests. The cave, in which the saint could neither sit upright nor stretch himself out, had a grated window with iron bars, through which he uttered his oracular responses to the wondering people. None even of the brethren of the order might penetrate into the dark sanctuary of his austerities. The ambassadors of the Conclave found an old man with a long shaggy beard, sunken eyes overhung with heavy brows, and lids swollen with perpetual weeping, pale hollow cheeks, and limbs meagre with fasting: they fell on their knees before him, and he before them. The future Cardinal-Poet was among the number: his barren Muse can hardly be suspected of invention.¹

So Peter Morrone the Hermit saw before him, in submissive attitudes, the three prelates, attended by the official notaries, who announced his election to the Papacy. He thought it was a dream; and for once assuredly there was a profound and religious reluctance to accept the highest dignity in the world. He protested with tears his utter inability to cope with the affairs, to administer the sacred trust, to become the successor of the Apostle.² The news spread abroad; the neighboring people came hurrying by thousands, delighted that

¹ Cardinal St. George, apud Muratori.

² The Cardinal St. George, however, asserts that Cœlestine hardly affected reluctance; and the Cardinal says that he was among a great multitude of all ranks, who clambered up the mountain,

“cursu conscendere montem
Gliscebam vates, membris vultuque resudans,”

to catch a glimpse of the Pope.

they were to have a saint, and their own saint, for a Pope. The Hermit in vain tried to escape ; he was brought back with respectful force, guarded with reverential vigilance. Nor was it the common people only who were thus moved. King Charles himself may not have been superior to the access of religious wonder, for to him especially (if indeed there was no design in the whole affair) this sudden unanimity among the ambitious Cardinals might pass for a miracle, more miraculous than many which were acknowledged by the common belief. The King of Naples, accompanied by his son, now in right of his wife entitled King of Hungary, hastened to do honor to his holy subject, to persuade the Hermit, who perhaps would be dazzled by royal flatteries into a useful ally, to accept the proffered dignity. The Hermit-Pope was conducted from his lowly cave to the monastery of Santo Spirito, at the foot of the mountain. He still refused to be invested in the pontifical robes. At length arrived the Cardinal Malebranca : his age, dignity, character, and his language, urging the awful responsibility which Peter Morrone would incur by resisting the manifest will of God, and by keeping the Popedom longer vacant (for all which he would be called to give account on the day of judgment), prevailed over the awe-struck saint. Not the least earnest in pressing him to assume at once the throne were his rude but not so unambitious hermit brethren : they too looked for advancement ; they followed him in crowds wherever he went, to Aquila and to Naples. Over his shaggy sackcloth at length the Hermit put on the gorgeous attire of the Pontiff ; yet he Peter Morrone Pope. would not go to Perugia to receive the homage of the Conclave. Age and the heat of the season (he had

been accustomed to breathe the mountain air) would not permit him to undertake the long unwonted journey. He entered the city of Aquila riding on an ass, with a King on each side of him to hold his bridle. Some of the indignant clergy murmured at this humiliation of the Papal majesty (the successor of St. Peter was wont to ride on a stately palfrey), but they suppressed their discontent.

If there had been more splendid, never was there Inauguration. so popular an election. Two hundred thousand spectators (of whom the historian, Ptolemy of Lucca, was one¹) crowded the streets. In the evening the Pope was compelled again and again to come to the window to bestow his benediction; and if hierarchical pride had been offended at the lowliness of his pomp, it but excited greater admiration in the commonalty: they thought of Him who entered Jerusalem "riding on an ass's colt." Miracles confirmed their wonder: a boy, lame from the womb, was placed on the ass on which the Pope had ridden; he was restored to the full use of his limbs.

But already the Cardinals might gravely reflect on their strange election. The Pope still obsti-
The Cardinals repent. nately refused to go to Perugia, or even to Rome, though they suggested that he might be conveyed in a litter. The Cardinals declared that they were not to be summoned to the kingdom of Naples. Two only, Hugh of Auvergne and Napoleon Orsini, condescended to go to Aquila. Malebranca probably had begun to droop under the illness which ere long carried him off. But the way in which the Pope began to use his vast powers still more appalled and offended

¹ "Quibus ipse interfui." — Ptolem. Luc.

them. He bestowed the offices in his court and about his person on rude and unknown Abruzzese; and to the great disgust of the clergy appointed a layman his secretary. High at once in his favor rose the French Prelate, Hugh Ascalon de Billiom, Arch-^{Hugh of Ascalon.}bishop of Benevento under Nicolas IV., Cardinal of St. Sabina. He had been the first to follow Malebranca in the acclamation of the Pope Morrone. On the death of Malebranca he was raised to the Bishopric of Ostia and Velletri, and became Dean of the College of Cardinals. Large pensions, charged on great abbeys in France, gilded his elevation. The Frenchman seemed destined to rule with undivided sway over the feeble Cœlestine: the Italians looked with undisguised jealousy and aversion on the foreign prelate.¹

The Cardinal, Napoleon Orsini, assisted at the inauguration, gave to the Pope the scarlet mantle, the mitre set with gold and jewels; he announced to the people that Peter had taken the name of Cœlestine V. The foot of the lowly hermit was kissed by kings, cardinals, bishops, nobles. He was set on high to be adored by the people.² The numbers of the clergy caused singular astonishment; but the Cardinals, though reluctant, would not allow the coronation to proceed without them; they came singly and in unwilling haste.³ Last

¹ Compare on Hugh Ascalon de Billiom, *Hist. Littér. de la France*, xx. 73.

² "Quod stupori erat videre, quia magis veniebant ad suam obtinendam benedictionem, quam pro præbendæ acquisitione." — Ptolem. Luc.

³ "Domini Jacobus de Colonna, et Dominus Rubeus, et Dominus Hugo de Ascalon" — (he must have been there before) — "Aquilam veniunt, factique sunt domini Curia, quod alii Cardinales videntes Aquilam properant." — Ptolem. Luc. *Annal.* p. 1298.

"Hæc postquam videre Rubri, seu morte Latini
Fracti animos, celerant ad tanta pericula cursim."

Cardin. St. George, p. 635.

of all came Benedetto Gaetani: he had deeply offended Charles of Naples by his haughty rebuke at Perugia. Coronation. Yet still, though all assisted at the ceremony, the place of honor was given to the French Cardinal: he anointed the new Pope, but the Pontiff was crowned by Matteo Rosso, after Malebranca's death, probably the elder of the Cardinals present.¹

A few months showed that meekness, humility, holiness, unworldliness might make a saint; they were not the virtues suited to a Pope. To Naples he had been led, as it were, in submissive triumph by King Charles; he took up his residence in the royal palace, an unsuspecting prisoner, mocked with the most ostentatious veneration. So totally did the harmless Cœlestine surrender himself to his royal protector, that he stubbornly refused to leave Naples. His utter incapacity for business soon appeared; he lavished offices, dignities, bishoprics, with profuse hand; he granted and revoked grants, bestowed benefices, vacant or about to be vacant.² He was duped by the officers of his court, and gave the same benefice over and over again; but still the greater share fell to his brethren from the Abruzzi. His officers issued orders of all kinds in his name. He shrunk from pub-

Cœlestine V.
in Naples.

¹ He was created by Urban IV.

² "Dabat enim dignitates, prælationes, officia et beneficia, in quibus non sequebatur curiæ consuetudinem, sed potius quorundam suggestionem, et suam rudem simplicitatem." — Jacob. a Vorag. apud Muratori S. R. T. ix. p. 54. Multa fecit de plenitudine potestatis, sed plura de plenitudine simplicitatis, *ibid.* The favoritism of the French Cardinal of St. Sabina, by this author's account, was generally odious.

"O quam multiplices indocta potentia formas
Edidit, indulgens, donans, faciensque recessu,
Atque vacaturas concedens atque vacantes."

Card. St. George.

— See also Ptolem. Luc. lxxiv. c. 29.

licity, and even from the ceremonial duties of his office; he could speak only a few words of bad Latin. One day, when he ought to have sat on the pontifical tribunal, he was sought in vain; he had taken refuge in the church, and was with difficulty persuaded to resume his state. His weakness made him as prodigal of his power as of his gifts.¹ At the dicta-
Sept. 1294.
 tion of King Charles he created at once thirteen new Cardinals, thus outnumbering the present Conclave.² Of these, seven were French; the rest Italians; of the latter, three Neapolitans, not one Roman. In order to place the Conclave more completely in the power of Charles, who intended to keep him till his death in his own dominions, he reënacted the Conclave law of Gregory X.

The weary man became anxious to lay down his heavy burden. Some of the Cardinals urged upon him that he retained the Papacy at the
Wishes to abdicate.
 peril of his soul. Gaetani's powerful mind (once at Naples, he resumed the ascendancy of his
Benedetto Gaetani.
 commanding abilities) had doubtless great influence in his determination. He was soon supposed to rule the Court and the Pope himself, to be Cœlestine's bosom counsellor.³ It was reported, and the trick was

¹ There was a small monkish tyranny about the good Cœlestine. He compelled the monks of the ancient and famous abbey of Monte Casino to wear the dress of his own order. The Cardinal-Poet is pathetic on this:—

“Syderei collis, Montisque Casini
 Compulit, heu! monachos habitus assumere fratrum
 Degentum sub lege Petri: (Morrone) nonnullus ab inde,
 Dum parere negat, monachus tunc exulat. O quam.
 Deciperis!”

² See the list in Ciacconius. One, a Beneventan, Cardinal of St. Vitale, died the next year.

³ “Gaetani — eo quod Regem Carolum Perusii multum exasperâsset, qui statim suis ministeriis et artibus factus est Dominus Curix et amicus Regis.”
 Ptolém. Luc. p. 1299.

attributed to Gaetani his ambitious successor, that through a hole skilfully contrived in the wall of his chamber, a terrible voice was repeatedly heard at the dead of night, announcing itself as that of a messenger of God. It commanded the trembling Pontiff to renounce the blandishments of the world, and devote himself to God's service. Rumor spread abroad that Cœlestine was about to abdicate. The King secretly, the monks of his brotherhood openly, worked upon the lower orders of Naples, and instigated them to a holy insurrection. Naples was in an uproar at this rumored degradation of the Pope. A long and solemn procession of all the clergy, of whom Ptolemy of Lucca was one, passed through the city to the palace. A Bishop, a kind of prolocutor, addressed him with a voice like a trumpet, urging him to abandon his fatal design. The speech was heard by Ptolemy of Lucca. Another Bishop from the walls announced that the Pope had no such intention. The Bishop below immediately broke out into a triumphant *Te Deum*, which was taken up by a thousand voices. The procession passed away.¹

But Advent was drawing on. Cœlestine would not Advent. pass that holy season in pomp and secular business. He had contrived a cell within the royal palace, from whence he could not see the sky. He had determined to seclude himself in all his wonted solitude and undisturbed austerities, like a bird, says the Cardinal-Poet, which hides its head from the fowler, and thinks that it is unseen.² He had actually signed a commission to three Cardinals to administer during his seclusion the affairs of the Popedom: it wanted but

¹ Ptolem. Luc. apud Muratori.

² P. 638.

the seal to be a Papal Bull. But this perhaps more dangerous step of putting the Papacy in commission was averted.

Long and inconclusive debates took place on the legality of a Papal abdication. Could any human power release him who was the representative of Christ on earth from his obligations? Could the successor of St. Peter, of his own free will, sink back into the ordinary race of men? Holy Orders were indelible: how much more indelible must be the consecration to this office, the fount and source of all Apostolic ordination? Cœlestine himself, from irresolution doubtless rather than artful dissimulation, had lulled his supporters, even the King himself, into security.¹ On a sudden, on the day of St. Lucia, the Conclave was summoned to receive the abdication of the Pope. The trembling Cœlestine alleged as the cause of his abdication, his age, his rude manners and ruder speech, his incapacity, his inexperience. He confessed humbly his manifold errors, and entreated the Conclave to bestow upon the world of Christendom a pastor not liable to such infirmities. The Conclave is said to have been moved to tears, yet no one (all no doubt prepared) refused to accept the abdication. But the Pope was urged first, while his authority was yet full and above appeal, to issue a Constitution declaring that the Pope might at any time lay down his dignity,

¹ "Dissimulans, ceu vera loquens, aliisque vacare,
Sollicitus, quo ad illa domus secreta, Patresque
Crediderint hunc nolle quidam dimittere primum.
Cumque foret generata fides, omnesque putarent,
Rex etiam, miri cæpisse obliviam facti,
Immemorem variumque Petrum, &c."

Card. St. George.

and that the Cardinals were at liberty to receive that voluntary demission of the Popedom. No sooner was Abdication. this done than Cœlestine retired ; he stripped off at once the cumbrous magnificence of his Papal robes and his two-horned mitre ; he put on the coarse and rugged habit of his brotherhood. As soon as he could, the discrowned pope withdrew to his old mountain hermitage.

The abdication of Cœlestine V. was an event unprecedented in the annals of the Church, and jarred harshly against some of the first principles of the Papal authority. It was a confession of common humanity, of weakness below the ordinary standard of men in him whom the Conclave, with more than usual certitude, as guided by the special interposition of the Holy Ghost, had raised to the spiritual throne of the world. The Conclave had been, as it seemed, either under an illusion as to this declared manifestation of the Holy Spirit, or had been permitted to deceive itself. Nor was there less incongruity in a Pope, whose office invested him in something at least approaching to infallibility, acknowledging before the world his utter incapacity, his undeniable fallibility. That idea, formed out of many conflicting conceptions, yet forcibly harmonized by long traditionary reverence, of unerring wisdom, oracular truth, authority which it was sinful to question or limit, was strangely disturbed and confused, not as before by too overweening ambition, or even awful yet still unacknowledged crime, but by avowed weakness, bordering on imbecility. His profound piety hardly reconciled the confusion. A saint, after all, made but a bad Pope.

It was viewed, in his own time, in a different light

by different minds. The monkish writers held it up as the most noble example of monastic, of ^{How thought of in his own} Christian perfection. Admirable as was his ^{time.} election, his abdication was even more to be admired. It was an example of humility stupendous to all, imitable by few.¹ The divine approval was said to be shown by a miracle which followed directly on his resignation ;² but the scorn of man has been expressed by the undying verse of Dante, who con- Dante. demned him who was guilty of the baseness of the "great refusal" to that circle of hell where are those disdained alike by mercy and justice, on whom the poet will not condescend to look.³ This sentence, so accordant with the stirring and passionate soul of the great Florentine, has been feebly counter- Petrarch. acted, if counteracted, by the praise of Petrarch in his declamation on the beauty of a solitary life, for which the lyrist professed a somewhat hollow and poetic admiration.⁴ Assuredly there was no magnanimity contemptuous of the Papal greatness in the abdication of Cœlestine : it was the weariness, the conscious inefficiency, the regret of a man suddenly wrenched away from all his habits, pursuits, and avocations, and unnaturally compelled or tempted to assume an ungenial dignity. It was the cry of passionate feebleness to be released from an insupportable burden.

¹ "Præbuit humilitatis exemplum, stupendum cunctis, imitabile paucis."
— Jordan. MS., quoted by Raynaldus.

² Bernard, in Chron. Roman. Pontif.

³ "Che fece per viltà il gran rifiuto."

Inferno, iii. 60.

I cannot for an instant doubt the allusion to Cœlestine; perhaps it was imbibed by Dante's hatred of Boniface VIII.

⁴ "Petrarch de Vitâ solitariâ," a rhetorical exercise.

Compassion is the highest emotion of sympathy which it would have desired or could deserve.

But coeval with Dante there was another, a ruder poet, who must be heard, that we may fully comprehend the times. Jacopone da Todi, the Franciscan, had been among those who hailed with mingled exultation and fear the advancement of the holy Cœlestine.¹ “What wilt thou do, Peter Morrone,

¹ “Che farai, Pier Morrone,
Se' venuto al paragone.

* * * *

Se 'l mondo e in te ingannato,
Seguirâ maledizione.

La tua fama alto è salita,
E in molta parte è gita:
Se ti tozza, a la finita,
A i buon sarai confusione.

Come segno a sagitta
Tutto il mondo a té s' affitta;
Se non tien bilancia ritta,
A Dio ne va appellazione.

* * * *

Questa corte e una fucina,
Ch' l' buon auro si ci afina.

* * * *

Se l' officio ti diletta,
Nulla malsania più infetta;
Bene e vita maladetta,
Perder Dio per tal boccone.

* * * *

Che' t' hai posto giogo in coglio,
Da temer tua damnatione.

* * * *

L' ordine Cardinalato,
Posto a in basso stato;
Che suo parentado
D' arriscar ha intentione.

* * * *

Guardate da barettiere,
Ch' el ner bianco fan videre;
Se non te fai ben schermire,
Canterai mala canzone.” — *Satir.* xv.

now that thou art on thy trial?" "If the world be deceived in thee, malediction! Thy fame has soared on high; it has spread through the world. If thou failest, there will be confusion to the good. As the arrow on its mark, the world is fixed on thee. If thou holdest not the balance right, there is no appeal but to God." "The Court of Rome is a furnace which tries the fine gold." "If thou takest delight in thine office (there is no malady so infectious), accursed is that life which for such a morsel loses God." "Thou hast put the yoke on thy neck, must we not fear thy damnation?" "The order of Cardinals has sunk to the lowest level: their sole aim is to enrich their kindred." "Guard thyself from the traffickers who make black white. If thou dost not guard thyself well, sad will be the burden of thy song." Yet in these mistrustful warnings of the poet there is the manifest pride and hope of a devoted partisan that a new era has begun, that Peter Morrone is destined to regenerate the Papacy. The abdication, no doubt, was the last event to which these hermit followers of Peter Morrone looked forward. Bitter must have been their disappointment when he himself thus frustrated their pious expectations, their passionate vaticinations; yet they adhered to him in his self-chosen lowliness; they were still his steadfast admirers; they denied his right to abdicate, no doubt they disseminated the rumors of the arts employed to frighten him from the throne. Their hatred of Boniface, who supplanted him, was as deep and obstinate as their love of Cœlestine. This poet will appear as at least cognizant of

There are other passages which betray the pride in the elevation of Pier Morrone.

the formidable conspiracy which threatened the power of Boniface VIII. Nor was the poet alone: his was but the voice which expressed, in its coarse but vigorous strains, the sense of a vast and to a certain extent organized party, in every rank, in every order, but especially among the low, and the lowest of the low.

CHAPTER VII.

BONIFACE VIII.

THE Conclave might seem determined to retrieve their former error in placing the devout but unworldly Cœlestine in the chair of St. Peter, by raising to the Pontificate a prelate of the most opposite character. Human nature could hardly offer a stronger contrast than Benedetto Gaetani and Peter Morrone, Boniface VIII. and Cœlestine V. Of all the Roman Pontiffs, Boniface has left the darkest name for craft, arrogance, ambition, even for avarice and cruelty. Against the memory of Boniface were joined in fatal conspiracy, the passions, interests, undying hostilities, the conscientious partisanship, the not ungrounded oppugnancies, not of individual foes alone, but of houses, of factions, of orders, of classes, of professions, it may be said of kingdoms. His own acts laid the foundation of this sempiternal hatred. In his own day his harsh treatment of Cœlestine and the Cœlestinians (afterwards mingled up or confounded with the wide-spread Fraticelli, the extreme and democratic Franciscans) laid up a deep store of aversion in the popular mind. So in the higher orders, his terrible determination to crush the old and powerful family of the Colonnas, and the stern hand with which he repressed others of the Italian nobles: his resolute Guelfism, his invitation of Charles

of Valois into Italy, involved him in the hatefulness of all Charles's tyranny and oppression. This with his own exile goaded the Guelf-born Dante into a relentless Ghibelline, and doomed Pope Boniface to an earthly immortality of shame and torment in the Hell of the poet. The quarrel with the King of France, Philip the Fair, brought him during his lifetime into formidable collision with a new power, the strength of which was yet unsuspected in Christendom, that of the lawyers, his fatal foes; and bequeathed him in later times throughout the writings of the French historians, and even divines (French national pride triumphing over the zeal of the Churchman), as an object of hostility during two centuries of the most profound Roman Catholic learning, and most perfect Roman Catholic eloquence. The revolt against the Papal power at the Reformation seized with avidity the memory of one, thus consigned in his own day, in life and after death, to the blackest obloquy, abandoned by most of his natural supporters, and from whose broad and undisguised assertions of Papal power later Popes had shrunk and attempted to efface them from their records. Thus Boniface VIII. has not merely been handed down, and justly, as the Pontiff of the loftiest spiritual pretensions, pretensions which, in their language at least, might have appalled Hildebrand or Innocent III., but almost all contemporary history as well as poetry, from the sublime verse of Dante to the vulgar but vigorous rhapsodies of Jacopone da Todi, are full of those striking and unforgotten touches of haughtiness and rapacity, many of which cannot be true, many no doubt invented by his enemies, many others are suspicious, yet all show the height of detestation which, either by adherence to

principles grown unpopular, or by his own arrogance and violence, he had raised in great part of Christendom. Boniface was hardly dead, when the epitaph, which no time can erase, from the impression of which the most candid mind strives with difficulty to emancipate itself, was proclaimed to the unprotesting Christian world: "He came in like a fox, he ruled like a lion, he died like a dog." Yet calmer justice, as well as the awful reverence for all successors of St. Peter, and the ardent corporate zeal which urges Roman Catholic writers on the forlorn hope of vindicating every act and every edict of every Roman Pontiff, have not left Boniface VIII. without defence; some, indeed, have ventured to appeal to the respect and admiration of posterity.¹

The abdication of Cœlestine took place on the feast of St. Lucia. The law of Gregory X., which Dec. 13. Conclave. secluded the Conclave in unapproachable separation from the world, had been reënacted, but was not enforced to its utmost rigor. Latino Malebrancha, the Cardinal who had exercised so much influence in the election of Cœlestine V., had been some months dead. The old Italian interest was represented by the Cardinals of the two great houses, long opposed in their fierce hereditary hostility, Guelf and Ghibelline, Matteo Rosso and Napoleon the Orsinis, and the two Colonnas, of whom the elder, Peter, was a man of bold and unscrupulous ambition. But the preponderance of num-

¹ Cardinal Wiseman has embarked in this desperate cause with considerable learning and more ingenuity. His article in the "Dublin Review," now reprinted in his Essays, was answered at the time by a clever paper in the "British and Foreign Review," in which may be traced an Italian hand. Since that time have appeared Tosti's panegyrical, but not very successful biography; and a fairer, more impartial Life by Drumann; not, however, in my opinion equal to the subject.

bers was with the new Cardinals appointed by Cœlestine at the dictation of Charles of Naples. Of these thirteen, seven (one was dead) were Frenchmen: it might seem that the election must absolutely depend on the will of Charles. Benedetto Gaetani stood alone; he was recommended by his consummate ability; but on that account, too, he was feared, perhaps suspected, by all who wished to rule, and few were there in the Conclave without that wish. The strong reaction might dispose the Cardinals to elect a Pope of the loftiest spiritual views, who might be expected to rescue the Papedom from its present state of impotency and contempt: but that reaction would hardly counterpoise the rival ambition of the Orsinis and Colonnas, and the sworn subserviency of so many to the King of Naples.

The Cardinal Benedetto Gaetani was of a noble family in Anagni, which city from its patriciate had already given two of its greatest Popes to the chair of St. Peter. He was of blameless morals, and unrivalled in his knowledge of the Canon law, equally unrivalled in experience and the despatch of business. He had been in almost every kingdom of Western Christendom, England, France, Portugal, as the representative of the Pope; was personally known to most of the monarchs, and acquainted with the politics and churches of most of the realms in Europe. It had been at first supposed that Benedetto Gaetani, who had insulted King Charles at Perugia, and had haughtily rebuked him for his interference with the Conclave, would not venture to Naples. He had come the last, and with reluctance:¹ but his knowledge of

¹ See quotation above from Ptolem. Luc. "Venit igitur ultimus, et sic scivit deducere sua negotia, quod factus esset quasi Dominus Curia." — c. xxii. Ptolemy was present during most of these proceedings.

affairs, and the superiority of his abilities, soon made him master in the deliberations of the Conclave. The abdication of Cœlestine had been, if not at his suggestion, urged on the irresolute and vacillating Pope by his commanding mind ; even if the vulgar artifices of frightening him into the determination were unnecessary, and beneath the severe character of Gaetani. The Conclave sat, in the Castel Nuovo at Naples, for ten days ; at the close, Benedetto Gaetani, as it seemed, by unanimous consent, was declared Pope. The secrets of the intermediate proceedings might undoubtedly transpire ; the hostility, which almost immediately broke out among all parties, would not scruple to reveal the darkest intrigues ; those intrigues would even take the most naked and distinct form. Private mutual understandings would become direct covenants ; promises made with reserve and caution, undisguised declarations. The vulgar rumors, therefore, would contain the truth, but more than the truth. It was no sudden acclamation, no deference at once to the superiority of Gaetani. The long delay shows a balance and strife of parties ; the conqueror betrays by his success that he conducted most subtly, or adroitly, the game of conquest. Gaetani, it is said, not only availed himself of the irreconcilable hostility between the Orsinis and Colonnas, but played each against the other with exquisite dexterity. Each at length consented to leave the nomination to him, each expecting to be named. Gaetani named himself ; the Orsini, Matteo Rosso, submitted ; the Colonnas betrayed their indignation ; and this, if not the first, was the deepest cause of the mutual unforgiving hatred.¹ From that time (it may

¹ Ferretus Vincentinus apud Muratori, S. R. T. t. ix. Ferretus, though

however be remembered that the Colonnas were Ghibelline) was implacable feud between the Pope and that house. But the Italian interest, represented by the Orsinis and Colonnas, no longer ruled the Conclave. Charles of Naples must be propitiated, for he held perhaps twelve suffrages. Gaetani suggested, it was said, at a midnight interview with Charles, that a weak Pontiff could not befriend the King with half the power which might be wielded by a strong one. "King Charles, your Pope Cœlestine had the will and the power to aid you, but knew not how; influence the Cardinals, your friends, in my favor, I shall have not only the will and the power, but the knowledge also to serve you."¹ Charles's obsequious Cardinals gave their vote for Gaetani, it may be presumed with the consent or cognizance at least of Charles. Nor in justice can it be denied that if he pledged himself to use every effort for the reconquest of Sicily, he did more than adhere with unshaken fidelity to his engagements, even when it had been perhaps the better Papal policy to have abandoned the cause. It was unquestionably through the Pope's consummate ability, rather than by favoring circumstances or the popularity of his character, that Charles afterwards maintained the contest for that kingdom. Guelfism, too, brought Charles and Benedetto Gaetani into one common interest.

Benedetto Gaetani was chosen Pope with all apparent unanimity on the 23d of December; no doubt it

a contemporary, is by no means an accurate writer: he has made some singular mistakes, and he wrote at Vicenza. Before it reached him, any private and doubtful negotiation, which we can hardly question took place, would become positive and determinate.

¹ "Re Carlo, il tuo Papa Celestino t' ha voluto e potuto servire, ma non ha saputo: onde se tu adoperi co' tuoi amici Cardinali ch   io son eletto Papa, io sapr   e vorr   e potr  ." — Villani, viii. 6.

was truly said, not to his own dissatisfaction.¹ He took the name of Boniface; it was reported that he intimat- ed by that name that he was to be known by deeds rather than by words. The abdication, the negotiation with the conflicting Cardinals, with Charles of Naples was the work of ten days, implying by its duration strife and resistance; by its rapidity despatch, and bold- ness in reconciling strife and surmounting difficulty.

But no sooner was Gaetani Pope, than he yearned for the independence, the sole supremacy, of Rome or the Roman dominions; he would not be a Pope, the instrument of, and in thrall to a King at Naples. The most pressing invitations, the most urgent remonstran- ces, would not induce him to delay; he hurried on by Capua, Monte Casino, Anagni. In his native city he was welcomed with festive dances; everywhere re- ceived with humble deference, deference which he en- forced by his lofty demeanor. At the gates of Rome he was met by the militia, by the knighthood, by the clergy of Rome, chanting in triumph, as though the Pope had escaped from prison. Italy, Christendom were to know that a true Pope had ascended the throne.

The inauguration of Boniface was the most magnifi- cent which Rome had ever beheld.² In his ^{Inauguration at Rome.} procession to St. Peter's and back to the Lat- Jan. 16, 1295.

¹ "Electus est ipse non invitus, non gemens." — Pepin. Chronic. apud Muratori, c. xli. Dante suggests the fraudulent means of success: —

"Sei tu sì tosto de quel haver sazio,
Per la qual non temesti torre a inganno,
La bella Donna, e di poi farne strazio."

Inferno, xix. 55.

² There is a very odd account of the difference of the voices of the Italian and French clergy during this ceremony: —

"Ille tonum Romanus avet clarum diapente,
Ille canit, ferit ille gravem quartam diatesron :

eran palace, where he was entertained, he rode not a humble ass, but a noble white horse, richly caparisoned: he had a crown on his head; the King of Naples held the bridle on one side, his son, the King of Hungary, on the other. The nobility of Rome, the Orsinis, the Colonnas, the Savellis, the Stefaneschi, the Annibaldi, who had not only welcomed him to Rome, but conferred on him the Senatorial dignity, followed in a body: the procession could hardly force its way through the masses of the kneeling people. In the midst, a furious hurricane burst over the city, and extinguished every lamp and torch in the church. A darker omen followed: a riot broke out among the populace, in which forty lives were lost. The day after, the Pope dined in public in the Lateran; the two Kings waited behind his chair. Before his coronation, Boniface took a solemn oath of fidelity to St. Peter and to the Church, to maintain the great mysteries of the faith, the decrees of the eight General Councils, the ritual and Order of the Church, not to alienate the possessions of the Church, and to restore discipline. This oath was unusual (at least in its length), it was attested by a notary, and laid up in the Pontifical Archives.¹

Immediately after the consecration, a Manifesto proclaimed to Christendom the voluntary abdication of

Lubricus in vocem nescit consistere pernix
 Italus, ipse notas refricans, ceu nubila guttas.
 At flatu melior vox Gallica lege morosum
 Præcinit, et guerble * geminans retinacula puncti
 Instar habet dure percussi incudibus æris."

Cardin. St. George.

¹ Pagi and others have shown that the profession of faith attached to this oath cannot be genuine. Qu.? forged when Boniface was afterwards accused of heresy?

* Wirbel, *Germ.*; warble, *Engl.*

Cælestine, on account of his acknowledged inexperience, incapacity, ignorance of secular affairs, love of devout solitude; and the elevation of Boniface, who had been compelled to accept the throne. But serious and dangerous doubts were still entertained, or might be made the specious pretext of rebellion against the authority of the Pope. Did the omnipotence of the Pope extend to the resignation of the office? His Bull, empowering himself to abdicate, and his abdication, were without precedent, and contrary to some canonical principles. Already, if not openly uttered, might be heard by the quick and jealous ears of Boniface some murmurs even among his Cardinals. No one knew better the versatility of Rome and of her nobles. Boniface was not the man to allow advantage to his adversaries, and adversaries he knew well that he had, and would have more, and those more formidable, if they should gain possession of the person of Cælestine, and use his name for their own anarchical purposes. Cælestine had abandoned the pomp and authority, he could not shake off the dangers Cælestine V. and troubles, the jealousies and apprehensions which belonged to his former state. The solitude, in which he hoped to live and die in peace, was closely watched; he was agitated by no groundless fears, probably by intimations, that it might be necessary to invite him to Rome. Once he escaped, and hid himself among some other hermits in a wood. But he could not elude the emissaries of Boniface. He received a more alarming warning of his danger, and fled to the sea-coast, in order to take refuge in the untrodden forests of Dalmatia. His little vessel was cast back by contrary winds; he was seized by the Governor of Iapygia, in

the district of the Capitanata. He was sent, according to the order of Boniface, to Anagni. All along the road, for above one hundred and fifty miles, the people, deeply impressed with the sanctity of Cœlestine, crowded around him with perilous homage. They plucked the hairs of the ass on which he rode, and cut off pieces of his garments to keep as relics. They watched him at night till he went to rest; they were ready by thousands in the early morning to see him set forth upon his journey. Some of the more zealous entreated him to resume the Pontificate. The humility of Cœlestine did not forsake him for an instant; everywhere he protested that his resignation was voluntary. He was brought into the presence of Boniface. Like the meanest son of the Church, he fell down at the feet of the Pope; his only prayer, a prayer urged with tears, was that he might be permitted to return to his desert hermitage. Boniface addressed him in severe language.

Imprison-
ment.

He was committed to safe custody in the castle of Fumone, watched day and night by soldiers, like a prisoner of state. His treatment is described as more or less harsh, according as the writer is more or less favorable to Boniface.¹ By one account, his cell was so narrow that he had not room to move; where his feet stood when he celebrated mass by day, there his head reposed at night. He obtained with difficulty permission for two of his brethren to be with him; but so unwholesome was the place, that they were obliged to resign their charitable office. According to another statement, the narrowness of his cell was his own choice: he was permitted to indulge in

¹ Ptolem. Luc., Stefaneschi. Vit. Celest. apud Bollandistas, with other Lives.

this meritorious misery; his brethren were allowed free access to him; he suffered no insult, but was treated with the utmost humanity and respect. Death released him before long from his spontaneous or enforced wretchedness. He was seized with a fever, generated perhaps by the unhealthy confinement, accustomed as he had been to the free mountain air. He died, May 19, 1296, was buried with ostentatious publi-

city, that the world might know that Boniface now reigned without rival, in the church of Ferentino.

The Cardinal Thomas, his own Cardinal, and Theodorick, the Pope's Chamberlain, conducted the ceremonial, to which all the prelates and clergy in the neighborhood were summoned.¹ Countless miracles were told of his death: a golden cross appeared to the soldiers shining above the door of his cell: his soul was seen by a faithful disciple visibly ascending to heaven. His body became the cause of a fierce quarrel, and of a pious crime. It was stolen from the grave at Ferentino, and carried to Aquila. An insurrection of the people of Ferentino was hardly quelled by the Bishop; on the assurance, after the visitation of the tomb, that the heart of the Saint had been fortunately left behind, they consented to abandon their design of vengeance. Immediately on the death of Boniface the canonization of Cœlestine was urgently demanded, especially by the enemies of that Pope. It was granted by Clement V. The monks of the Cœlestinian brotherhood (self-incorporated, self-organized) grew and flourished; they built convents in many parts of Italy, even in France. But the memory of the Pope, who had disdained and thrown aside the

¹ Supplementum Vit. S. Cælestin. apud Bollandistas.

Papal diadem, dwelt with no less veneration among the Fraticelli, the only true followers, as they averred, and in one respect justly averred, of St. Francis. The Cœlestinians were not, strictly speaking, Franciscans ; they were a separate Order ; owed their foundation, as they said, to the sainted Pope, but held the same opinions, sprang from the same class, seem at length to have merged into and mingled with the lower and more fanatic of the Minorites. Of them, and of the place assigned to Cœlestine in the visions of the Abbot Joachim, the Book of the Eternal Gospel, and in all the prophecies spread abroad by these wild sects, more hereafter.

Boniface surveyed Christendom with the haughty glance of a master, but not altogether with the cool and penetrating wisdom of a statesman. Noble visions of universal pacification, of new crusades, of that glorious but impracticable scheme of uniting Europe in one vast confederacy against Saracenic sway, swept before his thoughts. To a mind like his, which held it to be sacrilege or impiety to recede from any claim once made by the See of Rome and acknowledged by the ignorance, interests, or weakness of the temporal sovereign, the Papacy was a perilous height on which the steadiest head might become dizzy and lose its self-command. From Naples to Scotland the Papal supremacy was in possession of full, established, and acknowledged power, which took cognizance of the moral acts of sovereigns, their private life, their justice, humanity, respect for the rights of their subjects. It was thus absolutely illimitable. Besides this, the Popes held an actual feudal suzerainty over some of the smaller kingdoms, admitted by their kings in times of weakness, or

in order to legalize the usurpation of the throne by some new dynasty. For this power they could cite precedent, more or less venerable, recognized, uncontested; and precedent was universally held the great foundation of such tenure. It was an axiom of the Papal policy that rights, superiorities, sovereignties, once claimed by the Pope, belonged to the Pope: he claimed Corsica and Sardinia, partly as islands, partly as said to have formed a portion of the domains of the Countess Matilda, and then granted Corsica and Sardinia as his own inalienable, incontestable property. Not only Naples and Sicily, Arragon, Portugal, Hungary, Bohemia, Scotland, England — it was averred, though the indignant nation still repudiated, or but reluctantly acknowledged, the submission of John, and, still while it paid irregularly, murmured against the tribute — had been ceded as fiefs, or were claimed as owing that kind of allegiance. Over the Empire the Pope still asserted the privilege of the Pope's at least ratifying the election, of deposing the Emperor who might invade or violate the rights of the Roman See, rights indefinite and interpreted by his sole authority, against which lay no appeal. Even in France the ruling dynasty was liable to be reminded that the throne had been conferred by Pope Zacharias on Pepin the father of Charlemagne; so too on the Papal sanction rested its later transference to the House of Capet. Throughout Christendom the Pope had a kingdom of his own within every kingdom. The clergy, possessing a vast portion, in some countries more than half the land and wealth, and of unbounded influence, owed to him their first allegiance. They were assessable and to be taxed only for him or by his authority; and,

though occasionally refractory, occasionally more true to their national descent and their national pride than to their sacerdotal interests, and sometimes standing strongly on their separate hierarchical independence, yet as they held their independence of the civil power, their immunities from taxation, their distinct sacred character, chiefly from the Pope, and looked to his spiritual arms for their security and protection, they were everywhere his subjects in the first instance. And besides the clergy, and compelling the clergy themselves to more unlimited Papal obedience, the monastic orders, more especially the Friars, were his great standing army, his garrison throughout the Christian world.

Boniface had visited many countries in Europe. It is asserted that in his youth he studied law in Paris, and even that he had been canon in that church.¹ He had accompanied the Cardinal Ottobuoni to England, when sent by Alexander IV. to offer the crown of Sicily to the Prince Edmund. He had been joined in a mission with Matteo, Cardinal of Acqua Sparta, to adjust the conflicting claims of Charles of Anjou and Sicily, and of Rodolph, King of the Romans, to the inheritance of Provence. The treaty, which he drew, placed the Pope in the high office of arbiter in temporal as in spiritual matters. In any dispute as to the fulfilment or interpretation of the treaty the two Kings submitted themselves absolutely to the judgment of the Pope.² For his success in this

¹ Du Boulay, *Hist. Univers. Paris*. Tosti, *Storia di Bonifazio VIII.* to p. 31. He was canon also of Anagni, of Todi, of Lyons, of St. Peter in Rome. He was also Apostolic Notary.

² Raynald. sub ann. 1280.

legation Gaetani had been rewarded with the Cardinalate. Gaetani had been employed to dissuade Charles of Anjou from his duel at Bordeaux with the King of Arragon. He had sat in Rome in a commission upon the ecclesiastical affairs of Portugal. The student of law in the University of Paris returned to that city as Papal Legate (with the Cardinal of Parma) from Nicolas IV. They had the difficult commission to demand the refunding the tenths raised by Philip the Bold for a Crusade to the Holy Land, from his son Philip the Fair. He had thus experience of the stern rapacity of Philip the Fair, his defiance of all authority, even that of the Pope, in affairs of money. He had to allay the other most intense and dominant passion of the same Philip the Fair, hatred and jealousy of Edward I., King of England. On the first question he presided in a synod held in the church of St. Genevieve, a synod which ended in nothing. On the second point Philip was equally impracticable; he coldly repelled the advice which would reconcile him with his detested rival. The same Legates at Tarascon had been in- Feb. 18, 1291.structed to arrange the treaty between France, Charles of Naples, and Alfonso of Arragon. The peace had been settled, but broken off by the death of King Alfonso.

But in all his travels and his intercourse with these sovereigns, Boniface had not discerned, or his haughty hierarchical spirit had refused to see, the revolution which had been slowly working throughout Christendom: in France the growth of the royal power; in England the aspirations after religious as well as civil freedom; the advance of the Universities; the rise of the civil lawyers, who were to meet the clergy on their

own ground, and wrest from them the supremacy, or at least to confront them on equal terms in the field of jurisprudence — a lettered order, bound together by as strong a corporate spirit, and often hostile to the ecclesiastical canonists. Boniface had not discovered that the Papal power had reached, had passed its zenith; that his attempt to raise it even higher, to exhibit it in a more naked and undisguised form than had been dared by Gregory VII. or Innocent III., would shake it to its base.

Boniface was bound by gratitude to Charles, King of Naples, claimant of Sicily, perhaps by a plighted or understood covenant during his election. His first act was one of haughty leniency: he granted a remission of any forfeiture of the fief of Naples which might have been incurred by his father, Charles of Anjou, or by Charles himself, for not having fulfilled the conditions of his vassalage. If either should have become liable, not merely to forfeiture, but to excommunication, as having violated any one of the covenants imposed by his liege lord the Church, had neglected or refused to pay the stipulated tribute, and thereby incurred deprivation, the Pope condescended to grant absolution on the condition of full satisfaction to the Church.¹ On the sudden death of Charles of Hungary, during the absence of King Charles of Naples, the Pope acted at once as Liege Lord of Hungary, appointed his Legate Landulph, and afterwards, yielding to the petitions of the people, the Queen Maria as Regent of the realm.

The interests of the Papal See, no less than his alliance with Charles of Naples, bound Pope Boniface to

¹ Bull. apud Raynaldum.

reconcile, if possible, the conflicting pretensions of the Houses of Anjou and Arragon. The Arragonese, notwithstanding the reiterated grants of the kingdom of Sicily to the Angevine, notwithstanding the most solemn excommunications, and the most strenuous warfare of the combined Papal and Angevine armies, had still obstinately maintained their title by descent, election of the people, actual possession. The throne of Sicily had successively passed down the whole line of brothers, from Peter to Alfonso, from Alfonso to James, from James it had devolved, in fact, if not by any regular grant or title, through assent or connivance, on the more active and ambitious Frederick.

During the reign of the more peaceful James a treaty had been agreed to. Two marriages, to which Pope Cœlestine removed the canonical impediments, ratified the peace. James of Arragon was espoused to Blanche, the daughter of Charles; Robert, son of Charles, to Iolante, the sister of James.¹ Throughout this whole transaction the Pope (now Boniface) assumed, and it should seem without protest, the power to grant the kingdoms of Arragon and Valencia. In the surrender of those kingdoms by Charles of Valois, he insisted on the full recognition that he had held them by grant of the Pope. They were regranted to James of Arragon, who on this tenure did not scruple to accept, as the successor of his brother Alfonso, the hereditary dominions of his house. All who presumed to impede or to disturb this peace were solemnly excommunicated at Anagni on St. John the Baptist's day.

But the younger branches of the house of Arragon had not been so easily overawed by the terrors of the

¹ Briefs in Raynaldus, 1294.

Church to abandon the rich inheritance of Sicily, nor was Sicily, yet reeking with the blood shed at the Vespers, prepared to submit to the vengeance of the house of Anjou. The deep, inextinguishable hatred of the French was in the hearts of all orders ; it was nursed by the remembrance of their merciless oppressions ; the satisfaction of revenge once glutted, and the fear that the revolt, the Vesper massacre, and the years of war, would be even more terribly atoned for. Boniface knew the bold and ambitious character of Frederick, the younger son of the house of Arragon. He had a splendid lure for him — no less than the Empire of Constantinople. The Pope invited him to a conference. Frederick appeared on the coast of Italy with a powerful and well-appointed fleet, accompanied by John of Procida and the great Admiral Roger Loria, at Velletri. The Pope offered him the hand of Catherine Courtenay, the daughter of Philip, titular Latin Emperor of the East : all the powers of the West were to confederate and place her, with her young and valiant husband, on the Byzantine throne. To her likewise he had written, under the magnificent title of Empress of Constantinople, in a tone of parental persuasion and spiritual authority, urging her to give her hand to the brave Prince of Arragon.¹ By so doing she would show herself a worthy descendant of her grandfather Baldwin and her father Philip, a dutiful daughter of the Church ; she would not merely gain the glorious crown of her ancestors, but restore the erring and schismatical Greeks to their obedience to the Holy See.²

¹ Nicol. Special. ii. 21. Compare Amari, p. 363, ch. xiv.

² Brief of the Pope to Catherine of Courtenay, Raynald. sub ann. 1296 (27th June).

A treaty was formed on the following terms. Charles of Valois fully surrendered his empty title to Arragon, and acquired a title (as empty it proved) to the throne of Corsica and Sardinia, with large subsidies in money. James of Arragon had the full recognition of his right to the throne of Arragon, which he already possessed, peace, and the shame of having abandoned his brother and the claim of the house of Arragon to the throne of Sicily. The Pope secured, as he fondly hoped throughout, the lasting gratitude of Charles of Valois, the glory of having commanded peace, and the vain hope that he had deluded Frederick to surrender the actual possession of the throne of Sicily for a visionary empire in the East, which the Pope assumed the power, not of granting, but of having bestowed with the hand of the heiress to that barren title, Catherine of Courtenay. "A princess without a foot of land must not wed a prince without a foot of land; she was to bring her imperial dowry."¹

But the youthful Prince Frederick of Arragon was not so easily tempted by the astute Pontiff. He required time for consideration, and returned with his fleet to Sicily. Nor was James of Arragon so absolutely in earnest, nor so determined on the surrender of his hereditary claims on Sicily. In public he dared not own the treaty. Envoys were sent from Palermo to demand whether he had actually ceded the island to the Pope and the King of Naples. King James was forced to acknowledge that he had done so. On the publication of his answer, there was a cry in the streets of Palermo, "What sorrow is like unto our sorrow?" But in secret, it was said, King James had more than

¹ Brief of Pope Boniface, Raynald. 1296, c. 9.

suggested resistance. He was asked, "How, then, shall Prince Frederick act?" "He is a soldier, and knows his duty; ye, too, know your duty." John of Calamandra was sent by the Pope to Messina to offer a blank parchment to the Sicilians, on which they were to inscribe whatever exemptions, immunities, or securities, might tempt the nation to acknowledge the treaty. A noble, Peter de Ansalo, drew his sword, "It is by the sword, not by parchments, that Sicily will win peace." The Papal Envoy left the island with all the haste of terror.¹

Frederick was crowned in the Cathedral of Palermo, on Easter Day, with the acclamation of all Sicily, determined to resist to the utmost the abhorred dominion of the French. He sailed instantly with a powerful fleet, subjected Reggio and the country around, and threatened the whole kingdom of Naples. On Ascension Day the Pope condemned Frederick and the Sicilians by a bull, couched, if possible, in more than ordinarily terrific phrases. He heaped up charges of perfidy, usurpation, impiety, contempt of God and of his Church; he annulled absolutely and entirely the election of Frederick as King of Sicily; he threatened with excommunication, with the extremest spiritual and temporal penalties, all who should not instantly abandon his cause; he forbade all who owned spiritual allegiance to Rome to enter into treaty with him; and he revoked all indulgences, privileges, or immunities, granted at any time to the kingdom of Sicily, more especially all granted to those concerned in the consecration or rather execration of the usurping King. The Sicilians, strong in their patriotism and their hatred

March 21,
1296.

¹ Montaner, Nic Special. ii. 22.

of the French dominion, despised these idle fulminations. Charles must prepare for war, or rather the Pope in the name of Charles. But the resources of Naples were altogether exhausted; King Charles had paid a large sum to James of Arragon for the renunciation of his rights, and borrowed more of the Pope. Boniface was at once rapacious and liberal. He put off the day for the discharge of the first debt, and furnished five thousand ounces of gold. Charles was empowered to tax the Church property in his realm for this pious war, waged to maintain the rights of the Church.

The war of Sicily continued almost to the close of the Pontificate of Boniface VIII. King James of Arragon was summoned by the inflexible Pope to assist in wresting the kingdom from his brother; he received the title of standard-bearer of the Church. James obeyed with enforced but ostentatious obsequiousness. Yet he was suspected, perhaps not without reason, of a traitorous reluctance to conquer.¹ The war dragged on, aggressive on the side of Frederick against Naples, rather than endangering Sicily. Roger de Loria, affronted by an untimely suspicion of perfidy, A.D. 1297. yielded to the temptation of the principality over two barren islands on the coast of Africa, conquered from the Moors. The revolted Sicilian Admiral July 4, 1299. inflicted a terrible discomfiture on the fleet of his former sovereign, Frederick. But in the same year Frederick revenged himself by the total defeat of the army of Charles of Naples on the plains of Formicaria, and

¹ "Quod si sacer Princeps Ecclesiæ ipsum ad hæc per edicta verenda prorsus impellat, se licet invitum, Dei magis quam hominum offensam metuentem, necesse quidem esse favorabiliter obsequi. Cupiebat enim fratris ruinam, sed ut omnis objectio legitimâ causâ vestiretur, compelli voluit."

—Ferret. Vicentin. apud Muratori, S. R. T. xi. p. 959.

the capture of his son Philip of Tarento. In the next
A.D. 1302. year another naval victory raised still higher
 the fame of Roger Loria, who seemed to carry with
 him, whichever cause he espoused, the dominion of the
 sea. But the invasion of Sicily was baffled by the
 prudence and Fabian policy of King Frederick. The
 Pope, at length weary of the expenditure, suspecting
 the lukewarm aid of James of Arragon, and not yet
 in open breach with Philip King of France, summoned
 Philip's brother, Charles of Valois, whose successes in
 Flanders had obtained for him the fame of a great gen-
 eral, to aid the final conquest of Sicily. Perhaps he
 meditated the transference of the crown of Naples and
 Sicily from the feeble descendants of the house
Affairs of Sicily. of Anjou to the more powerful Charles of
 Valois. The summons to Charles of Valois was, as
 the invitation to French princes by the Pope to take
 part in Italian affairs has ever been, fatal to the liber-
 ties and welfare of Italy, ruinous to the Popes them-
 selves. He did but crush the liberties of Florence, and
 left the excommunicated Frederick on the throne of
 Sicily.¹ "He came," says the historian, "to bring
 peace to Florence, and brought war; to wage war
 against Sicily, and concluded an ignominious peace."
 His invasion of Sicily with an overwhelming force only
 made more obstinate the resistance of the Sicilians:
 they met him not in the field; they allowed him to

¹ "Tempo veggio non molto doppo anchori
 Che tragge un altro Carlo fuor di Francia,
 Per far meglio conoscer se e' i suoi;
 Senz' arme n' esca solo; e con la lancia
 Con la quel giostra Giuda; e quella punta
 Sì, che a Fiorenza fa scoppiar la pancia."

Purgat. xx. 70.

wear away his army in vain successes.¹ Boniface heard before his death that a treaty of peace had been sealed, leaving Frederick in peaceable possession of the whole island for his lifetime, under the title of King of Trinacria. The only price which he paid was the acceptance as his wife of a daughter of the house of Anjou. Frederick of Arragon, notwithstanding the terms of the treaty, by which on his death the crown of Sicily was to revert to the King of Naples, handed it quietly down to his own posterity. But we must return hereafter to Charles of Valois.

Boniface aspired to be the pacificator of Italy, but it was not by a lofty superiority to the passions ^{Boniface} of the times, by tempering the ferocity of the ^{a Guef.} conflicting factions, and with a stern but impartial justice repressing Guef and Ghibelline; it was rather by avowedly proclaiming himself the head of the Gueflic interest, seizing the opportunity of the feebleness of the Empire to crush all the Imperialist faction, and to annul all the Imperial rights in Italy. Anagni had been a Ghibelline city; the Gaetani a Ghibelline family. But in Boniface the Churchman had long struggled triumphantly against the Ghibelline; the Papacy wrought him at once into a determined Guef. Even before his pontificate he had connected himself with the Orsini, the enemies of his enemies, the Colonnas. The Ghibellines spread stories about Pope Boniface; true or false, naked or exaggerated truth, they found ready credence. The Ghibellines were masters, through the Orsis and Spinolas, of Genoa; the Archbishop Stephen Porchetto was of that family. In the solemn service of the Church, when the Pope strews ashes on the heads of

¹ The war may be read fully and well told in the last chapter of Amari.

all, to admonish them of the nothingness of man, instead of the usual words, Boniface broke out, "Ghibelline, remember that thou art dust, and with all other Ghibellines to dust thou shalt return."¹

The Colonnas centred in themselves everything which could keep alive the well-grounded fear, the jealousy, the vindictiveness of the Pope, as well as justify his desire of order, of law, and of peace. They had Ghibellinism, power, wealth, lawlessness, ill-concealed doubts of his title to the Papacy, no doubt ambition to transfer the Papacy to themselves. Under Nicolas IV. they had ruled supreme over the Pope; under Gaetani, would they endure to be nothing? All the Papacy could give or add to their vast possessions, titles, ranks, were theirs, or had been theirs but a few years ago. They had long been the great Ghibelline house. In Rome, still more in the Romagna, they had fortresses held to be impregnable — Palestrina, Nepi, Zagaruola, Colonna; and these gave them, if not the absolute command of the region, the power of plundering and tyrannizing with impunity. Nor was that power under any constraint for respect of sacred things, of humanity, or of justice. They might become what the Counts and Nobles of former centuries had been, masters of the Papal territories, of the Papacy itself.

The Colonnas were strong, as has been seen, even in the conclave, in which sat two Cardinals of that house. The death of Cœlestine had not removed all doubt as to the validity of the election of Boniface. No one knew better than Boniface how the Colonnas had been

¹ This, according to Muratori, if ever said, must have been said to Archbishop Porchetto, who succeeded Jacob a Voragine (author of the *Legenda Aurea*). — Muratori, S. R. I. ix. Note on Jacob a Voragine, p. 10.

deceived into giving their favorable suffrages, how deeply, if silently, they already repented of their weakness; how ready they would be to fall back on the illegality of the whole affair. There can be little question that they were watching the opportunity of revolt as eagerly as Boniface that of crushing the detested house of Colonna. It concerned his own security not less than that of the Papacy: the uncontested sovereignty of the Pope over his own dominions; the permanent rescue of the throne of St. Peter from the tyranny of a fierce and unscrupulous host of bandit chieftains, and from Ghibellines at the gates of Rome, and even in Rome.¹

The Colonnas were so ill-advised, or so unable to restrain each other, as to give a plausible reason, and more than one reason, for the Pope to break out in just it seemed, if implacable, resentment. The Colonna, who held the city of Palestrina, surprised and carried off on the road to Anagni a rich caravan of furniture belonging to the Pope. The crime of one was the crime of all. But heavier charges were not wanting which involved the whole house. They were accused of conspiracy, as doubtless they had conspired in their wishes if not in overt acts, with Frederick of Arragon and the Sicilians. It was said that they had openly received in Palestrina Francis Crescentio and Nicolas Pazzi, citizens of Rome, envoys from Frederick of Arragon.² There is a dark indication that

¹ Compare Raynaldus, sub ann. 1297, p. 233.

² Muratori doubts this (p. 256); it is not brought forward as a specific charge by the Pope, but for this the Pope might have his reasons. It is asserted by Villani, viii. 21; Ptolem. Lucen. in *Annal. Chronicon Foroliviens.* S. H. T. xxii. Tosti has rather ostentatiously brought forward a new cause of hostility. Cardinal James Colonna was trustee for his three

already France was tampering in the opposition to Boniface.¹

A Bull came forth denouncing the whole family, their ancestors, as well as the present race, with indiscriminate condemnation, but concentrating all the penalty on the two Cardinals.² "Having taken into consideration the wicked acts of the Colonnas in former times, their present manifest relapse into their hereditary guiltiness, and our just fears of their former misdeeds, it is clear as daylight that this odious house of Colonna, cruel to its subjects, troublesome to its neighbors, the enemy of the Roman Republic, rebellious against the Holy Roman Church, the disturber of the public peace in the city and in the territory of Rome, impatient of equals, ungrateful for benefits, stranger to humility, and possessed by madness, having neither fear nor respect for man, and an insatiable lust to throw the city and the whole world into confusion, has endeavored (here follow the specific charges) to instigate our dear sons James of Arragon and the noble youth Frederick to rebellion." The Pope then avows that he had summoned the Colonnas to surrender their castles of Palestrina, Colonna, and Zagaruola, into his hands. Their refusal to obey this imperious demand was at once the proof and the aggravation of their disloyalty. "Believing, then," he proceeds, "the rank of Cardinal held by these stubborn and intractable men to be a scandal to the faithful, we

brothers, and robbed them of their property. They appealed to the Pope. From Patrini, *Memorie Penestrine*. Rome, 1795.

¹ See note p. 226.

² The Bull in Raynaldus, A. D. 1297.

have determined, after trying those milder measures (the demand of the unconditional surrender of their castles), in the strength of the power of the Most High, to subdue the pride of the aforesaid James and Peter, to crush their arrogance, to cast them forth as diseased sheep from the fold, to depose them forever from their high station." He goes on to deprive them of all their ecclesiastical rank and revenues, to declare them excommunicate, and to threaten with the severest censures of the Church all who should thenceforth treat them as Cardinals, or in any way befriend their cause. Such partisans were to be considered in heresy, schism, and rebellion, to lose all ecclesiastical rank, dignity, or bishopric, and to forfeit their estates. The descendants of one branch were declared incapable, to the fourth generation, of entering into holy orders. Such was the attainder for their spiritual treason.

The Colonnas had offered, on the mediation of the Senator and the Commonalty of Rome, to ^{Reply of the Colonnas.} submit themselves in the fullest manner to the Pope.¹ But the Pope would be satisfied with nothing less than the surrender of all their great castles. Therefore, when they could no longer avoid it, they accepted the defiance to internecine war. They answered by a proclamation of great length, hardly inferior in violence, more desperately daring than that

¹ The senators and commonalty of Rome had persuaded the Colonnas to this course. "Suaserunt, induxerunt quod ad pedes nostros reverenter venirent, nostra et ipsius Romanæ Ecclesiæ absolute ac liberè mandata facturū; ad quæ præfati schismatici et rebelles ipsis ambasciatoribus responderunt, se venturos ad pedes nostros ac nostra et præfata Ecclesiæ mandata facturos." — Epist. Bonifac. ad Pandect. Savelli, Orvieto, 29th Sept.

of the Pope. They repudiated altogether the right of Boniface to the Pontificate; they denied the power of Cœlestine to resign. They accused Boniface of obtaining the abdication of Cœlestine by fraudulent means, by conditions and secret understandings, by stratagems and machinations; ¹ they appealed to a General Council, that significant menace, in later times of such fearful power. This long argumentative declaration of the Colonna Cardinals was promulgated in all quarters, affixed to the doors of churches, and placed on the very altar of St. Peter. But the Colonnas stood alone; none other of the Conclave joined them; no popular tumult broke out on their side. Their allies, and allies they doubtless had, were beyond the Faro; within the Alps, Ghibellinism was overawed, and abandoned its champions, notwithstanding their purple, to the unresisted Pontiff. Boniface proceeded to pass his public sentence against his contumacious spiritual vassals. The sentence was a concentration of all the maledictory language of ecclesiastical wrath. No instrument, after a trial for capital treason,

Papal sentence.
Dec. 1297.

¹ These words are remarkable: — “Quod in renuntiatione ipsius multæ fraudes et doli, conditiones et intendimenta, et *machinamenta*, et tales et talia intervenisse *multipliciter asseruntur*, quod esto, quod posset fieri renuntiatio, de quo merito dubitatur, ipsam vitiarent et redderent illegitimam, inefficacem, et nullam.” — Apud Raynald. sub ann. 1297, No. 34. But the most remarkable fact regarding this document is that it was attested in the Castle of Longhezza by five dignitaries of the Church of France, the Provost of Rheims, the Archdeacon of Rouen, three canons, of Chartres, of Evreux, and of Senlis; and by three Franciscan friars, of whom one was the famous poet *Jacopone da Todi*, afterwards persecuted by Boniface. This is of great importance. The quarrel with Philip the Fair had already begun in the year before; the Bull “Clericis Laicos” had been issued; and here is a confederacy of the Colonnas, the agents of the King of France, and the Cœlestinian Franciscans. It bears date May 10, 1297. — Dupuy, *Preuves du Différend*.

in any period, was drawn with more careful and vindictive particularity. It was not content with treating the appeal as heretical, blasphemous, and schismatical, but as an act of insanity. The Pope had an unanswerable argument against their denial of the validity of his election, their undisturbed, unprotesting allegiance during three years, their recognition of the Pope by assisting him in all his papal functions. The Bull denounced their audacity in presuming, after their deposition, to assume the names and to wear the dress and insignia of Cardinals. The penalty was not merely perpetual degradation, but excommunication in its severest form; the absolute confiscation of the entire estates, not only of the Cardinals, but of the whole Colonna family. It included, by name, John di San Vito, and Otho, the son of John, the brother of the Cardinal James and the father of Cardinal Peter, Agapeto, Stephen, and James Sciarra, sons of the same John, with all their kindred and relatives, and their descendants forever. It absolutely incapacitated them from holding rank, office, function, or property. All towns, castles, or places which harbored any of their persons fell under interdict; and the faithful were commanded to deliver them up wherever they might be found.

This proscription, this determination to extinguish one of the most ancient and powerful families of Italy, with the degradation of two Cardinals, was an act of vigor and severity beyond all precedent. Nor was it a loud and furious but idle menace. Boniface had not miscalculated his strength. The Orsini lent all their forces to humble the rival Colonnas, and a Crusade was proclaimed, a Crusade against two Cardinals of

the Church, a Crusade at the gates of Rome.¹ The same indulgences were granted to those who should take up arms against the Cardinals and their family which were offered to those who warred on the unbelievers in the Holy Land. The Cardinal of Porto, Matthew Acquasparta, Bishop of St. Sabina, commanded the army of the Pope in this sacred war. Stronghold after stronghold was stormed; castle after castle fell.² Palestrina alone held out with intrepid obstinacy. Almost the whole Colonna house sought their last refuge in the walls of this redoubted fortress, which defied the siege, and wearied out the assailing forces. Guido di Montefeltro, a famous Ghibelline chieftain, had led a life of bloody and remorseless warfare, in which he was even more distinguished by craft than by valor. He had treated with contemptuous defiance all the papal censures which rebuked and would avenge his discomfiture of many papal generals and the depression of the Guelfs. In an access of devotion, now grown old, he had taken the habit and the vows of St. Francis, divorced his wife, given up his wealth, obtained remission of his sins, first from Cœlestine, afterwards from Boniface, and was living in quiet in a convent at Ancona.³ He was summoned from his

¹ Raynaldus, sub ann. 1298. Dante puts these words in the mouth of Guido di Montefeltro: —

“ Lo principe di nuovi Pharisei,
 Havendo guerra presso a Laterano,
 E non con Saracin nè con Giudei;
 Che ciascuno suo nimico era Christiano;
 E nessun era stato a vincer Acri,
 Ne mercatante in terra di Soldano.”

Inferno, c. xxvii.

² Ptolem. Lucen. p. 1219.

³ Tosti, the apologetic biographer of Boniface VIII., endeavors to raise some chronological difficulties, which amount to this, that Palestrina sur-

cell on his allegiance to the Pope, and with plenary absolution for his broken vows, commanded to inspect the walls, and give his counsel on the best means of reducing the stubborn citadel. The old soldier surveyed the impregnable defences, and then, requiring still further absolution for any crime of which he might be guilty, uttered his memorable oracle, "Promise largely; keep little of your promises."¹ The large promises were made; the Colonnas opened their gates; within the prescribed three days appeared the two Cardinals, with others of the house, Agapeto and Sciarra, not on horseback, but more humbly, on foot, before the Pope at Rieti. They were received with outward blandness, and admitted to absolution. Surrender of Palestrina.

They afterwards averred² that they had been tempted to surrender with the understanding that the Papal banners were to be displayed on the walls of Palestrina; but that the Papal honor once satisfied, perhaps the fortifications dismantled, the city was to be restored to its lords. Not such was the design of Boniface. He determined to make the rebellious city an example of righteous pontifical rigor. He first condemned it to be no longer the seat of a Bishop, then commanded, as elder Rome her rival Carthage, that it should be utterly razed to the ground, passed over by the plough, and

rendered in the month of September, and that Guido di Montefeltro died at Assisi (it might be suddenly, he was an old worn-out man) on the 23d or 29th of that month.

¹ "Lunga promessa, con attender corto." — *Inferno*, xx. Comment. di Benvenuto da Imola (apud Murator.), Ferret. Vicent. Pipinus (ibid.). These are Ghibelline writers; this alone throws suspicion on their authority. But Dante writes as of a notorious fact. Tosti's argument, which infers from the Colonna's act of humiliation, of which he adduces good evidence, that the surrender was unconditional, is more remarkable for its zeal than its logic.

² In the proceedings before Clement V. apud Dupuy.

sown with salt, so as never again to be the habitation of man.¹ A new city, to be called the Papal city, was to be built in the neighborhood.

The Colonnas found that they had nothing to hope, much to fear from the Pope, who was thus destroying, as it were, the lair of these wild beasts, whom he might seem determined to extirpate, rather than permit to resume any fragment of their dangerous power. Though themselves depressed, humbled, they were still formidable by their connections. The Pope accused them, justly it might be, such desperate men, of meditating new schemes of revolt. The Annibaleschi, their relatives, a powerful family, had raised or threatened to raise the Maremma. Boniface seized John of Ceccano of that house, cast him into prison, and confiscated all his lands. The Colonnas fled; some found
Flight of the Colonnas. refuge in Sicily; Stephen was received with honor in France. The Cardinals retired into obscurity. In France, too, after having been taken by corsairs, arrived Sciarra Colonna, hereafter to wreak the terrible vengeance of his house upon the implacable Pope.

Throughout Italy Boniface had assumed the same
Italy. imperious dictatorship. His aim, the suppression of the interminable wars which arrayed city against city, order against order, family against family, was not unbecoming his holy office; but it was in the tone of a master that he commanded the world to peace, a tone which provoked resistance. It was not by persuasive influence, which might lull the conflicting passions of men, and enlighten them as to their real in-

¹ "Ipsamque aratro subjici et veteris instar Carthaginis Africanæ, ac saltem in eum et fecimus et mandavimus seminari, ut nec rem, nec nomen, nec titulum haberet civitatis." — See the edict in Raynaldus.

terests. Nor was his arbitration so serenely superior to the disturbing impulse of Guelfic and Papal ambition as to be accepted as an impartial award. The depression of Ghibellinism, not Christian peace, might seem his ultimate aim.

Italy, however, was but a narrow part of the great spiritual realm over which Boniface aspired to maintain an authority surpassing, at least in the plain boldness of its pretensions, that of his most lofty predecessors. Boniface did not abandon the principle upon which the Popes had originally assumed the right of interposing in the quarrels of kings, their paramount duty to obey his summons as soldiers of the Cross, and to confederate for the reconquest of the Holy Land. But this object had shrunk into the background; even among the religious, the crusading passion, by being diverted to less holy purposes, was wellnigh extinguished; it had begun even to revolt more than stir popular feeling. But Boniface rather rested his mandates on the universal, and, as he declared, the unlimited supremacy of the Roman See.

The great antagonistic power which had so long wrestled with the Papacy had indeed fallen ^{The Empire.} into comparative insignificance. The Em-^{Adolph of Nassau.}pire, under Adolph of Nassau (though acknowledged as King of the Romans he had not yet received the Imperial crown), had sunk from a formidable rival into an object of disdainful protection to the Pope.

On the death of Rodolph of Hapsburg the Princes of Germany dreaded the perpetuation of the ^{A.D. 1291.} Empire in that house, which had united to its Swabian possessions the great inheritance of Austria. Albert of Austria, the son of Rodolph, was feared and hated;

feared for his unmeasured ambition, extensive dominions, and the stern determination with which he had put down the continual insurrections in Austria and Styria; hated for his haughty and overbearing manners, and the undisguised despotism of his character. Wenzel, King of Bohemia, Albert, Elector of Saxony, Otho the Long, Margrave of Brandenburg, were drawn together by their common apprehensions and jealousy of the Austrian. The ecclesiastical Electors were equally averse to an hereditary Emperor, and to one of commanding power, ability, and resolution. But it was not easy to find a rival to oppose to the redoubted Albert, who reckoned almost in careless security on May, 1292. the succession to the Empire, and had already seized the regalia in the Castle of Trefels. Siegfried, Archbishop of Cologne, suggested the name of Adolph of Nassau, a prince with no qualification but intrepid valor and the fame of some military skill, but with neither wealth, territory, nor influence. Gerhard, the subtle Archbishop of Mentz, seized the opportunity of making an Emperor who should not merely be the vassal of the Church of Rome, but even of the Church in Germany. It was said that he threatened severally each elector that, if he refused his vote for Adolph, the Archbishop would bring forward that Prince who would be most obnoxious to each one of them. Adolph of Nassau was chosen King of the Romans, but he was too poor to defray the cost of his own coronation: the magistrates of Frankfort opposed a tax which the Archbishop threatened to extort from the Jews of that city. The Archbishop of Mentz raised 20,000 marks of silver on the lands of his See; and so the coronation of Adolph took place at Aix-la-

June 24,
1292.

Chapelle. But there was no disinterestedness in this act of the Archbishop. The elevation of Adolph of Nassau, if it did not begin, was the first flagrant example of the purchase of the Imperial crown by the sacrifice of its rights. The capitulations¹ show the times. The King of the Romans was to compel the burghers of Mentz to pay a fine of 6000 marks of silver, Terms exacted by the Archbishop of Mentz. July 1. imposed upon them by the Emperor Rodolph, for some act of disobedience to their Prelate; he was neither in act nor in counsel to aid the burghers against that Prelate; never to take Ulric of Hanau or Master Henry of Klingenberg into his counsels, or to show them any favor, but always to espouse the cause of the Archbishop and of the Church against these troublesome neighbors; he was to grant to the Archbishop certain villages and districts, with the privilege of a free city; to grant certain privileges and possessions to certain relatives of the Archbishop; to protect him by his royal favor against the Duke of Brunswick, and all his enemies; to grant the toll at Boppard on the Rhine in perpetuity to the Church of Mentz; to pay all the debts due from the Archbishop to the Court of Rome, and to hold the Archbishop harmless from all processes in respect of such debts; to repay all charges incurred on account of his coronation; to grant to the Archbishop the Imperial cities of Muhlhausen and Nordhausen, and to compel the burghers to take the oath of fealty to him. Nor was this all. Among the further stipulations, the Emperor was to make over the Jews of Mentz (the Jews of the Empire were now the men of the Emperor) to the Archbishop; this superiority had been usurped by the

¹ Wurdthwein. Diplom. Moguntiaca, i. 28.

burghers of Mentz. The Emperor was not to intermeddle with causes which belonged to the spiritual Courts; not to allow them to be brought before temporal tribunals; to leave the Archbishop and his clergy, and also all his suffragan bishops, in full possession of their immunities and rights, castles, fortresses, and goods. One article alone concerned the whole principedom of the Empire. No prince was to be summoned to the Imperial presence without the notice of fifteen weeks, prescribed by ancient usage. The other ecclesiastical electors were not quite so grasping in their demands: Cologne and Treves were content with the cession of certain towns and possessions. Adolph submitted to all these terms, which, if he had the will, he had hardly the power to fulfil.¹

The Emperor, who was thus subservient to the Archbishop of Mentz, was not likely to offer any dangerous resistance to the pretensions of the Pope; and to him Pope Boniface issued his mandates and his inhibitions as to a subject. Adolph might at first have held the balance between the conflicting Kings of France and England; his inclinations or his necessities drove him into the party of England. A. D. 1294. He sent a cartel of defiance to the King of France, to which King Philip rejoined, if not insultingly, with the language of an equal. But the subtle as well as haughty Philip revenged himself on the hostile Empire by taking more serious advantage of its weakness. The last wreck of the kingdom of Arles, Provence, became part of the kingdom of France: the old county of Burgundy, Franche Comté, by skilful negotiations;

¹ Compare throughout Schmidt, *Geschichte der Deutschen*, viii. p. 115, *et seq.*

was severed from the Empire.¹ These hostile measures, and the subsidies of England, were irresistible to the indigent yet warlike Adolph. He declared himself the ally of Edward; and when Boniface sent two Cardinals to command France and England to make peace, at the same time the Bishops of Reggio and Sienna had instructions to warn the Emperor, under the terror of ecclesiastical censures, not to presume to interfere in the quarrel. The Pope's remonstrance was a bitter insult: "Becomes it so A.D. 1295.

great and powerful a Prince to serve as a common soldier for hire in the armies of England?"² But English gold outweighed Apostolic censure and scorn. In the campaign in Flanders the Emperor Adolph had 2000 knights in arms on the side and in the pay of England. The rapid successes, however, of the King of France enabled Adolph at once to fulfil his engagements with England without much risk to his subsidiary troops. The Emperor was included in the peace to which the two monarchs were reduced under the arbitration of Boniface.³

The reign of Adolph of Nassau was not long. Boniface may have contributed unintentionally to its early and fatal close by exacting the payment of the debt due from Gerhard of Mentz to the See of Rome, which Adolph was under covenant to discharge, but wanted the will or the power, or both. He would not apply the subsidies of England to this object. There was deep and sullen discontent throughout Germany.

At the coronation of Wenzel as King of Bohemia,

¹ Leibnitz, *Cod. G. Diplom.* x. No. 18, p. 32.

² *Apud Raynald.* 1295, No. 45.

³ The documents may be read in Raynaldus and in Rymer, *sub annis*. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Deutschen*, viii. p. 130, *et seq.*

Gerhard of Mentz performed the solemn office; thirty-June 2, 1297. eight Princes of the Empire were present. Albert of Austria was lavish of his wealth and of his promises.¹ Gerhard was to receive 15,000 marks of silver. Count Hageloch was sent to Rome to purchase the assent of the Pope to the deposition of Adolph, and a new election to the Empire. Boniface refused all hearing to the offer. But Albert of Austria trusted to himself, his own arms, and to the League, which now embraced almost all the temporal and ecclesiastical Princes, the Elector of Saxony, the young Margrave of Brandenburg, Herman the Tall, the Ambassadors of Bohemia and Cologne. Adolph was declared deposed; Albert of Austria elected King of the Romans. The crimes alleged against Adolph were that he had plundered churches, debauched maidens, received pay from his inferior the King of England. He was also accused of having broken the seals of letters, administered justice for bribes, neither maintained the peace of the Empire, nor the security of the public roads. Thrice was he summoned to answer, and then condemned as contumacious. The one great quality of Adolph of Nassau, his personal bravery, was his ruin; he hastened to meet his rival in battle near Worms, plunged fiercely into the fray, and was slain.

The crime of Adolph's death (for a crime it was July 2, 1298. declared, an act of rebellion, treason, and murder, against the anointed head of the Empire) placed Albert of Austria at the mercy of the Pope. The sentence of excommunication was passed, which none but the Pope could annul, and which, suspended over the head of the King elect of the Romans, made

¹ Schmidt, p. 137.

him dependent, to a certain degree, on the Pope, for the validity of his unratified election, the security of his unconfirmed throne. And so affairs stood till the last fatal quarrel of Boniface with the King of France made the alliance of the Emperor not merely of high advantage, but almost of necessity. His sins suddenly disappeared. The perjured usurper of the Empire, the murderer of his blameless predecessor, became without difficulty the legitimate King of the Romans, the uncontested Sovereign of the Holy Roman Empire.

CHAPTER VIII.

BONIFACE VIII. ENGLAND AND FRANCE.

IF the Empire had sunk to impotence, almost to contempt, the kingdoms of France and England were rising towards the dawn of their future greatness. Each too had begun to develop itself towards that state which it fully attained only after some centuries, England that of a balanced constitutional realm, France that of an absolute monarchy. In England the kingly power was growing into strength in the hands of the able and vigorous Edward I.; but around it were rising likewise those free institutions which were hereafter to limit and to strengthen the royal authority. The national representation began to assume a more regular and extended form; the Parliaments were more frequent; the boroughs were confirmed in their right of choosing representatives; the commons were taking their place as at once an acknowledged and an influential Estate of the realm; the King had been compelled more than once, though reluctantly and evasively, to renew the great charters.¹ The law became more distinct and authoritative, but it was not the Roman law, but the old common law descended from the Saxon times, and guaranteed by the charters wrested from the Norman

England.
Development
of Constitu-
tion.

¹ Throughout Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii. 160, 166.

kings. It grew up beside the canon law of the clergy, each rather avoiding the other's ground, than rigidly defining its own province. Edward was called the Justinian of England, but it was not by enacting a new code, but as framing statutes which embodied some of the principles of the common law of the kingdom. The clergy were still a separate caste, ruled by their own law, amenable almost exclusively to their own superiors ; but they had gradually receded or been quietly repelled from their coördinate administration of the affairs and the justice of the realm. They were one Estate, but in the civil wars they had been divided : some were for the King, some boldly and freely sided with the Barons ; and the Barons had become a great distinct aristocracy, whom the King was disposed to balance, not by the clergy, but by the commons. The King's justices had long begun to supersede the mingled court composed of the bishops and the barons : some bishops sat as barons, not as bishops. The civil courts were still wresting some privilege or power from the ecclesiastical. The clergy contended obstinately, but not always successfully, for exclusive jurisdiction in all causes relating to Church property, or property to which the Church advanced a claim, as to tithes. There was a slow, persevering determination, notwithstanding the triumph of Becket, to bring the clergy accused of civil offences under the judgment of the King's courts, thus infringing or rather abrogating the sole cognizance of the Church over Churchmen.¹ It was enacted that the clerk might be arraigned in the King's court, and not surrendered to the ordinary till the full inquest in the matter of accusation had been

¹ See the whole course of this silent change in Hallam, ii. pp. 20-23.

carried out. On that the whole estate, real and personal, of the felon clerk might be seized. The ordinary thus became either the mere executioner, according to the Church's milder form of punishment, of a sentence passed by the civil court, or became obnoxious to the charge of protecting, or unjustly acquitting a convicted felon. If, while the property was thus boldly escheated, there was still some reverence for the sacred person of the "anointed of the Lord,"¹ even archbishops will be seen, before two reigns are passed, bowing their necks to the block (for treason), without any severe shock to public feeling, or any potent remonstrance from the hierarchy. On the other hand, the singular usage, the benefit of clergy, by expanding that benefit over other classes, tended to mitigate the rigor of the penal law, with but rare infringements of substantial justice.²

In France the royal power had grown up, checked France. by no great league of the feudal aristocracy, limited by no charter. The strong and remorseless rule of Philip Augustus, the popular virtues of Saint Louis, had lent lustre, and so brought power to the throne, which in England had been degraded by the tyrannical and pusillanimous John, and enfeebled by the long, inglorious reign of Henry III. In France the power of the clergy might have been a sufficient, as it was almost the only organized counterpoise to the kingly prerogative; but there had gradually risen, chiefly in the Universities, a new power, that of the

¹ The alleged Scriptural groundwork of this immunity, "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm" (Ps. cv. 15), was enshrined in the Decretals as an eternal, irrevocable axiom.

² On benefit of clergy read the note in Sergeant Stephens's Blackstone, v. iv. p. 466.

Lawyers: they had begun to attain that ascendancy in the Parliaments which grew into absolute dominion over those assemblies. But the law <sup>The Law-
yers.</sup> which these men expounded was not like the common law of England, the growth of the forests of Germany, the old free Teutonic usages of the Franks, but the Roman imperial law, of which the Sovereign was the fountain and supreme head. The clergy had allowed this important study to escape out of their exclusive possession. It had been widely cultivated at Bologna, Paris, Auxerre, and other universities. The clergy had retired to their own stronghold of the canon law, while they seemed not aware of the dangerous rivals which were rising up against them. The Lawyers became thus, as it were, a new estate: they lent themselves, partly in opposition to the clergy, partly from the tendency of the Roman law, to the assertion and extension of the royal prerogative. The hierarchy found, almost suddenly, instead of a cowering superstitious people, awed by their superior learning, trembling at the fulminations of their authority, a grave intellectual aristocracy, equal to themselves in profound erudition, resting on ancient written authority, appealing to the vast body of the unabrogated civil law, of which they were perfect masters, opposing to the canons of the Church canons at least of greater antiquity. The King was to the lawyers what Cæsar had been to the Roman Empire, what the Pope was to the Churchmen. Cæsar was undisputed lord in his own realm, as Christ in his. The Pandects, it has been said, were the gospel of the lawyers.¹

¹ Compare Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, vii. 6, 10, and the eloquent but as usual rather overwrought passage in Michelet.

On the thrones of these two kingdoms, France and England, sat two kings with some resemblance, yet with some marked oppugnancy in their characters. Edward I. and Philip the Fair were both men of unmeasured ambition, strong determination of will, with much of the ferocity and the craft of barbarism; neither of them scrupulous of bloodshed to attain his ends, neither disdainful of dark and crooked policy. There was more frank force in Edward; he was by nature and habit a warlike prince; the irresistible temptation of the crown of Scotland alone betrayed him into ungenerous and fraudulent proceedings. In Philip the Fair the gallantry of the French temperament broke out on rare occasions: his first Flemish campaigns were conducted with bravery and skill, but Philip ever preferred the subtle negotiation, the slow and wily encroachment; till his enemies were, if not in his power, at least at great disadvantage, he did not venture on the usurpation or invasion. In the slow systematic pursuit of his object he was utterly without scruple, without remorse. He was not so much cruel as altogether obtuse to human suffering, if necessary to the prosecution of his schemes; not so much rapacious as, finding money indispensable to his aggrandizement, seeking money by means of which he hardly seemed to discern the injustice or the folly. Never was man or monarch so intensely selfish as Philip the Fair: his own power was his ultimate scope; he extended so enormously the royal prerogative, the influence of France, because he was King of France. His rapacity, which persecuted the Templars, his vindictiveness, which warred on Boniface after death as though life, was this selfishness in other forms.

Edward of England was considerably the older of the two Kings. As Prince of Wales he had shown great ability and vigor in the suppression of the Barons' wars ; he had rescued the endangered throne. He had been engaged in the Crusades ; his was the last gleam of romantic valor and enterprise in the Holy Land, even if the fine story of his wife Eleanora sucking the poison from his wound was the poetry of a later time. On his return from the East he heard of his father's death ; his journey through Sicily and Italy was the triumphant procession of a champion of the Church ; the great cities vied with each other in the magnificence of his reception. He had obtained satisfaction for the barbarous and sacrilegious murder of his kinsman, Henry of Almain, son of Richard of Cornwall, in the cathedral of Viterbo during the elevation of the Host, by Guy de Montfort with his brother Simon. The murderer (Simon had died) had been subjected to the most rigorous and humiliating penance.¹

Since his accession Edward had deliberately adhered to his great aim, the consolidation of the whole Nov. 1271. British islands under his sovereignty, to the comparative neglect of his continental possessions. He aspired to be the King of Great Britain rather than the vassal rival of France. He had subdued Wales ; he had established his suzerainty over Scotland ; he had awarded the throne of Scotland to John Baliol, whom he was

¹ The documents relating to this strange murder are most of them in Rymer and in the MS., B. M. See especially letter of Gregory X., Nov. 29, 1273. Guy sought to be admitted to this Pope's presence at Florence ; he with his accomplices followed the Pope two miles out of the city, without shoes, without clothes, except their shirts and breeches. Guy threw himself at the Pope's feet, wept and howled, "*alt et bas sine tenore.*" On the subsequent fate of Guy of Montfort see Dr. Lingard, vol. iii. p. 186.

almost goading to rebellion, in order to find a pretext for the subjugation of that kingdom. Edward, in the early part of his reign, was on the best terms with the clergy: he respected them, and they respected him. The clergy under Henry III. would have ruled the superstitious King with unbounded authority had they not been involved in silent stubborn resistance to the See of Rome. Henry, as has been seen, heaped on them wealth and honors; but he offered no opposition to, he shared in, their immoderate taxation by Rome; he did not resist the possession of some of the richest benefices and bishoprics by foreigners. If his fear of the clergy was strong, his fear of the Pope was stronger; he was only prevented from being the slave of his own ecclesiastics because he preferred the remote and no less onerous servitude to Rome.¹ But this quarrel of the English clergy with Rome was somewhat reconciled: the short lives of the later Popes, the vacancy in the See, the brief Papacy of Cœlestine, had relaxed, to some extent, the demands of tenths and subsidies. Edward therefore found the hierarchy ready to support him in his plans of insular conquest. John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, accompanied him to Wales, and pronounced an excommunication against the rebellious princes: no voice was raised against the cruel and ignominious executions with which Edward secured and sullied his conquest.² Against the massacre of the bards, perhaps esteemed by the English clergy mere barbarians, if not heathens, there was no remonstrance. Among the hundred and four judges

¹ We must not forget his difficulties about Prince Edmund's claim to Sicily.

² Collier, i. p. 484.

appointed to examine into the claims of the competitors for the Scottish throne, Edward named twenty-four. Of these were four bishops, two deans, one archdeacon, and some other clergy. The Scots named eight bishops and several abbots. Edward's great financial measure, the remorseless plunder and cruel expatriation of the Jews, was beheld by the clergy as a noble act of Christian vigor. Among the cancelled debts were vast numbers of theirs ; among the plunder no inconsiderable portion had been Church property, pawned or sold by necessitous or irreligious ecclesiastics. The great wealth obtained for the instant by the King might stave off, they would fondly hope, for some time, all demands on the Church.¹

If Edward of England meditated the reduction of the whole British islands under one monarchy, and had pursued this end since his accession with unswerving determination, Philip the Fair coveted with no less eager ambition the continental territories of England. He too aspired to be King of all France, not mere feudal sovereign over almost independent vassals, but actual ruling monarch. He had succeeded in incorporating the wreck of the kingdom of Arles with his own realm. He had laid the train for the annexation of Burgundy : his son was affianced to the daughter and heiress of Otho V. Edward, however, had given no cause for aggression ; he had performed with scrupulous punctiliousness all the acts of homage and fealty which the King of France could command for the land of Gas-

¹ Hist. of Jews, iii. 352, 354. The documents may be read in *Anglia Judaica*. Tovey says (p. 244) whole rolls of patents relating to their estates are still remaining in the Tower. Have we not any Jewish antiquaries to explore this mine ?

cony, Guienne, and the other hereditary possessions of the Kings of England.

There had been peace between France and England for the unusual period of thirty-five years, but Long peace.
1259 to 1294. already misunderstanding and jealousies had begun. Peace between two such Kings, in such relation to each other, in such an age, could hardly be permanent. The successes of Edward in his own realm stimulated rather than appalled the unscrupulous ambition of Philip. An accidental quarrel among the mariners of the two nations was the signal for the explosion of these smouldering hostilities. The quarrel led to piratical warfare, waged with the utmost cruelty along the whole British Channel and the western coast of France. The King of France was only too ready to demand satisfaction. Edward of England, though reluctant to engage in continental warfare, could not abandon his own subjects; yet so absorbed was Edward in his own affairs that he became the victim of the grossest artifice. The first offenders in the quarrel had been sailors of Edward's port of Bayonne. It was indispensable for the honor of France that they should suffer condign punishment. Guienne must be surrendered for a time to the Suzerain, the King of France, that he might exercise his unresisted jurisdiction over the criminals. Philip was permitted to march into Guienne, and to occupy with force some of the strongest castles. On the demand of restitution he laughed to scorn the deluded Edward; negotiations, remonstrances, were equally unavailing. The affront was too flagrant and humiliating, the loss too precious; war seemed inevitable. Edward, by his heralds, renounced his allegiance; he would no longer be the man, the

vassal, of a King who violated all treaties sworn to by their common ancestors. But the Barons and the Churchmen of England were now averse to foreign wars: their subsidies, their aids, their musters, were slow, reluctant, almost refused. Each Sovereign strengthened himself with foreign allies: Edward, as has been said, subsidized the Emperor Adolph of Nassau, and entered into a league with the Counts of Flanders and of Bar, who were prepared to raise the standard of revolt against their Suzerain, the King of France. Philip entered into hardly less dangerous correspondence with the opponents of Edward's power in Scotland.¹

So stood affairs between the kingdoms of France and England at the accession of Boniface VIII. Accession of Boniface. Dec. 1294. Philip had now overrun the whole of Gascony, and Edward had renounced all allegiance, and declared that he would hold his Aquitanian possessions without fealty to the King of France; but the Seneschal of Gascony had been defeated and was a prisoner.² Duke John of Brabant had risen in rebellion against the King of France; he had been compelled to humiliating submission by Charles of Valois. Almost the first act of Boniface was to command peace. Berard, Cardinal Bishop of Alba, and Simon, Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina, were sent as Legates, armed with the power of releasing from all oaths or obligations which might stand in the way of pacification, and of inflicting ecclesiastical censures, without appeal, upon all, of whatsoever degree, rank, or condition, who should

¹ Documents in Rymer, sub ann. 1294. Walsingham, 61. Hume, Edward I.

² Jordanus apud Raynald. Matt. Westmonast. sub ann.

rebel against their authority.¹ The Cardinals crossed to England; they were received in a full Parliament at Westminster. The King of England ordered his brother Edmund and John de Lacy to explain the causes of the war, his grievances and insults endured from the King of France. The Cardinals peremptorily insisted on peace. Edward replied that he could not make peace without the concurrence of his ally the King of the Romans. The Cardinals urged a truce; this Edward rejected with equal determination. They endeavored to prevent the sailing of Edward's fleet, already assembled in the ports of the island. Edward steadily refused even that concession. But Boniface was not so to be silenced; he declared all existing treaties of alliance null and void, and peremptorily en-

June 24, 1295, joined a truce from St. John Baptist's day to 1296.

until the same festival in the ensuing year.² To Edward he wrote expressing his surprise and grief that he, who in his youth had waged only holy wars against unbelievers, should fall off in his mature age into a disturber of the peace of Christendom, and feel no compunction at the slaughter of Christians by each other. He wrote, as has been told, in more haughty and almost contemptuous language to the King of the Romans; he reproached him for serving as a base mercenary of the King of England: the King of the Romans, if disobedient, could have no hope or claim to the Imperial Crown; obedient, he might merit not only the praise of man, but the favor and patronage of the Apostolic See. The Archbishop of Mentz was commanded to give no aid whatever to the King of the

¹ Instructions in Raynald. sub ann. 1295.

² Raynald. sub ann. 1296.

Romans in this unholy war ; on Adolph too was imperatively urged the truce for a year.¹

The Cardinal Legates, Alba and Palestrina, discouraged by their reception in England, did not venture to appear before the more haughty and irascible Philip of France with the Pope's imperious mandate ; they assumed that the truce for a year, enjoined by the Pope, would find obsequious observance. Boniface did not think fit to rebuke their judicious prudence ; but of his own supreme power ordered that on the expiration of the first year the truce should be continued for two years longer.²

The blessings of peace, the league of all Christian princes against the Infidel, might be the remote and splendid end which Boniface either had or thought he had in view in his confident assertion of his inhibitory powers, and his right of interposing in the quarrels of Christian princes. But there was one immediate and pressing evil which could not well escape his sagacity. Such wars could no longer be carried on without the taxation of the clergy. Not merely was the Pope the supreme guardian of this inestimable immunity, freedom from civil assessments, but it was impossible that the clergy either could or would endure the double burdens imposed on them by their own Sovereigns and by the See of Rome. All the subjects of the Roman See, as they owed, if not exclusive, yet superior allegiance to the Pope, so their vast possessions must be tributary to him alone,

Taxation of
the clergy.

Inevitable
results of
war.

¹ Letters apud Raynald. 1295. The Nuncios in Germany, the Bishops of Reggio and Sienna, had full powers to release from all oaths and treaties. See above, p. 26.

² The Bull in Raynaldus (1296, No. 19), addressed to Adolph, King of the Romans.

at least his permission must be obtained for contributions to secular purposes. Wars, even if conducted on the perfect feudal principle (each Lord, at the summons of the Crown, levying, arming, bringing into the field, and maintaining his vassals at his own cost), were necessarily conducted with much and growing expense for munitions of war, military engines, commissariat however imperfect, vessels for freight, if in foreign lands. But the principle of feudalism had been weakened; war ceased to be the one noble, the one not ignominious calling, the duty and privilege of the aristocracy at the head of their retainers. No sooner had agriculture, commerce, manufactures, become respectable and lucrative; no sooner must armies be raised and retained on service, even in part, by regular pay, than the cost of keeping such armies on foot began to augment beyond all proportion. The ecclesiastics who held Knights' Fees were bound to furnish their quota of vassals; they did often furnish them with tolerable regularity; they had even appeared often, and still appeared, at the head of their contingent; yet there must have been more difficulty, more frequent evasion, more dispute as to liability of service, as the land of the realm fell more and more into the hands of the clergy. Though the great Statute of Mortmain, enacted by successive Kings, the first bold limitary law to the all-absorbing acquisition of land by the clergy, may have been at first more directly aimed at other losses sustained by the Crown, when estates were held by ecclesiastic or monastic bodies, such as reliefs upon succession, upon alienation, upon wardships and marriages, which could not arise out of lands held by perpetual corporations and corporations perpetuated

Statute of
Mortmain.

by ecclesiastical descent; yet among the objects sought by that Statute must have been that the Crown should be less dependent on ecclesiastical retainers in time of war.

This Mortmain Statute,¹ of which the principle was established by the Great Charter, only applied to religious houses. The second great Charter of Henry III. comprehended the whole Hierarchy, Bishops, Chapters, and Beneficiaries. The Statute of Edward endeavored to strike at the root of the evil, and prohibited the receiving land in mortmain, whether by gift, bequest, or any other mode; the penalty was the forfeiture of the land to the Lord, in default of the Lord to the King. But the law, or the interpretation of the law, was still in the hands or at the command of the clergy, who were the only learned body in the realm. Ingenious devices were framed, fictitious titles to the original fief, fraudulent or collusive acknowledgments, refusal or neglect to plead on the part of the tenant, and so recoveries of the land by the Church, as originally and indefeasibly its own; afterwards grants to feoffees in perpetuity, or for long terms of years, for the use of religious houses or ecclesiastics. It required two later Statutes, that of Westminster under Edward I. (in his eighteenth year), finally that of Richard II. (in his fifteenth year), before the skill and ingenuity of this hierarchical invasion of property was finally baffled, and an end put to the all-absorbing aggression of the Church on the land of England.²

The Popes themselves had, to a certain extent, given the authority and the precedent in the direct taxation of the clergy for purposes of war; but these were for

¹ 7th Edward I. Compare Hallam, ii. p. 24.

² Blackstone, ii. ch. 18.

holy wars. Sovereigns, themselves engaged in crusades, or who allowed crusades to be preached and troops raised and armed in their dominions for that sacred object, occasionally received grants of twentieths, tenths, or more, on the ecclesiastical revenues for this religious use. In many instances the Sovereigns, following the examples, as was believed, of the Popes themselves, had raised the money under this pretext and applied it to their own more profane purposes, and thus had learned to look on ecclesiastical property as by no means so sacred, to hold the violation of its peculiar exemptions very far from the impious sacrilege which it had been asserted and believed to be in more superstitious times. But all subsidies, which in latter years had begun to be granted in England, at least throughout the reign of Henry III., had been held to be free gifts, voted by the clergy themselves in their own special Synods or Convocations. Now, however, these voluntary subsidies, suggested by the King's friends among the clergy, but liable to absolute refusal, had grown into imperative exactions. Edward, as his necessities became more urgent, from his conquests, his intrigues, his now open invasion of Scotland, and the impending war with France, could not, if he hoped for success, and was not disposed from any overweening terror of the spiritual power, to permit one third or one half¹ (if we are to believe some statements), at all events a very large portion of the realm, to withhold its contribution to the public service. The wealth of the clergy, the facility with which, if he once got over his religious fear and scruples, such taxes could be

¹ See the passage in Turner's *Hist. of England*, v. p. 166. This subject will be discussed hereafter.

levied ; the natural desire of forestalling the demands of Rome, which so fatally, according to the economic views of the time, drained the land of a large portion of its wealth ; perhaps his own mistaken policy in expelling the Jews, and so inflicting at once a heavy blow on the trade of the country, and depriving him of a wealthy class whom he might have plundered in a more slow and productive manner without remorse, resistance, or remonstrance ; all conspired to urge the King on his course. Certainly, whatever his motives, his wants, or his designs, Edward had already asserted in various ways his right to tax the clergy in the boldest manner, had raised the tax to an unprecedented amount, and showed that he would hesitate at no means to enforce his demands. He had obtained from Pope Nicolas IV. (about 1291) a grant of the tenth of the whole ecclesiastical property, under the pretext of an expedition to the Holy Land, a pretext which the Pope would more easily admit from a Prince who had already displayed his zeal and valor in a Crusade, and of which Edward himself, after the subjugation of Wales and Scotland and the security of his French dominions, might remotely contemplate the fulfilment. This grant was assessed on a new valuation,¹ enforced on oath, and which probably raised to a great amount the value of the Church property, and so increased the demands of the King, and aggravated the burdens of the clergy.²

¹ This valuation was maintained, as that on which all ecclesiastical property was assessed, till the time of Henry VIII. It was published in 1802 by the Record Commission, folio.

² In the MS., B. M., sub ann. 1278, vol. xiii., is an account of the "Societas" of the Ricardi of Florence, for tenths collected in England. The total sum (the details of each diocese are given, but some, as Canterbury and London, do not appear) is 11,035*l.*, xiv. solidi, 3 denarii. The bankers un-

By another more arbitrary act, before his war in Guienne, Edward had appointed Commissioners to make inquisition into the treasuries of all the religious houses and chapters in the realm. Not only were these religious houses in possession of considerable accumulations of wealth, but they were the only banks of deposit in which others could lay up their riches in security. All these sums were enrolled in the Exchequer, and, under the specious name of loans, carried off for the King's use.

But with the King's necessities, the King's demands
A.D. 1294. grew in urgency, frequency, imperiousness. It was during the brief Pontificate of Cœlestine V., when Robert of Winchelsea, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was at Rome to receive his pall from the hands of the Pope, that the King in a Parliament at Westminster demanded of the clergy a subsidy of half of their annual revenue. The clergy were confounded; they entreated permission to retire and consult on the grave question. William Montfort, Dean of St. Paul's, was chosen to persuade the King to desist from, or at least to reduce his demand to some less exorbitant
July. amount. The Dean had hardly begun his

dertake to deliver the same in London or any place, "*ultra et citra mare.*" They take upon themselves all risks of pillage, theft, violence, fire, or shipwreck. Whence their profits does not appear. "*E io Rainieri sopra-dito con la mia mano abo inscrito quie di sotto, e messo lo mio sugello, con quello dela compagnia.*" Other signatures follow. In a later account, after the valuation of Nicolas IV., dated Aug. 30, vol. xv., the whole property, with the exception of the goods of the Bishops of Winchester and Lincoln, and Christ Church, Canterbury, is set at 204,143*l.* 19*s.* 2*d.* et oboli; the tenth, 20,404*l.* 19*s.* 2*d.* et oboli. Winton and Lincoln, 3977*l.* 15*s.* 7*d.* &c.; tenth, 397*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.* 10 oboli. Christ Church, 355*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.*; tenth, 35*l.* 10*s.* 11*d.* Special tax on pluralities, 73*l.* 19*s.* 11*d.* 1. Total collected, 20,855*l.* 7*s.* 3*d.* In another place, the Dean of St. Paul's, as treasurer (vol. xiii. p. 110), accounts for the sum of 3135*l.* 7*s.* 3*d.* 1, arrears for three years.

speech, when he fell dead at the feet of the King. Edward was unmoved; he might perhaps turn the natural argument of the clergy on themselves, and treat the death of Montfort as a judgment of God upon a refractory subject. He sent Sir John Havering to the Prelates, who were still shut up in the royal palace at Westminster. The Knight was to proclaim that whoever opposed the King's will was to come forth and discover himself; and that the King would at once proceed against him as a disturber of the public peace. The spirit of Becket prevailed not among the Prelates; no one would venture to put to the test the stern and determined Edward. They submitted with ungracious reluctance, in hopes no doubt that their Primate would soon appear among them; and that he, braced, as it were, by the air of Rome, would bear the brunt of opposition to the King.¹

If the necessities of Edward drove him to these strong measures against the clergy of England, the French hierarchy had still more to dread from the insatiable rapacity and wants of Philip the Fair. That rapacity, the remorseless oppression of the whole people by the despotic monarch, and his loss of their loyal affection, was now so notorious that the Pope, in one of his letters to the King, speaks of it as an admitted fact.² Philip had as yet been engaged in no expensive wars; his court might indulge in some coarse pomp and luxury; yet trade might have flourished, even arts and manufactures might have been intro-

¹ Compare Collier, *Ecc. Hist.* i. p. 493, folio edit.

² "Ipsi quidem subditi adeo sunt diversis oneribus aggravati, quod eorum ad te solita et subjecta multum putatur infriguisse devotio, et quanto amplius aggravantur, tanto potius in posterum refrigescat." — Ad. Philip Reg. Dupuy, p. 16.

duced from Flanders and Italy, but for the stern and exterminating measures of his rude finance. His coffers were always filling, never full; and he knew no way of raising a revenue but by direct and cruel extortion, exercised by himself, or by his farmers of the taxes under his seal and authority. Two Italian bankers, the brothers Biccio and Musciatto dei Francesi, possessed his entire confidence, and were armed with his unlimited powers. But the taxes wrung from the tenants of the crown, from the peasants to whom they left not the seed for the future harvest, were soon exhausted, and of course diminished with every year of intolerable burden: other sources of wealth must be discovered.

The Jews were the first; their strange obstinacy in money-making made them his perpetual victims. Philip might seem to feed them up by his favor to become a richer sacrifice:¹ he sold to particular persons acts of security; he exacted large sums as though he would protect them in fair trade from their communities. At length after some years of this plundering and pacifying, came the fatal blow, their expulsion from the realm with every aggravation of cruelty, the seizure and confiscation of their property.² What is more strange, the persecuted and exiled Jews were in five years rich and numerous enough to tempt a second expulsion, a second confiscation.

But in France the Jews had formidable commercial rivals in the Italian bankers. Philip respected wealthy Christians no more than wealthy misbelievers. The whole of these peaceful and opulent men

¹ In 1288 he forbade the arbitrary imprisonment of the Jews at the desire of any monk. This seems to have been a common practice.

² Hist. of Jews, iii. p. 319.

were seized and imprisoned on the charge of violating the laws against usury ; and to warn them from that unchristian practice, they were mercifully threatened with the severest tortures, to be escaped only on the payment of enormous mulcts.¹ Some resisted ; but the jailers had their orders to urge upon the weary prisoners the inflexible determination of the King. Most of them yielded ; but they fled the inhospitable realm ; and if they left behind much of their actual wealth, they carried with them their enterprise and industry.² The Francesis, Philip's odious financiers, derived a double advantage from their departure, the plunder of their riches and the monopoly of all the internal trade, which had been carried on by their exiled countrymen, with the sole liberty no doubt of violating with impunity the awful laws against usury.

Philip even had strength and daring to plunder his Nobles ; under the pretext of a sumptuary The nobles. law, which limited the possession of such pompous indulgences to those few who possessed more than six thousand livres tournois³ of annual revenue, he demanded the surrender of all their gold and silver plate, it was averred, only for safe custody ; but that which reached the royal treasury only came out in the shape of stamped coin. This stamped coin was greatly inferior, in weight and from its alloy, to the current money. The King could not deny or dissemble the iniquity of this transaction ; he excused it from the urgent necessities of the kingdom ; promised that the treasury would

¹ Villani, vii. c. 146.

² Villani, (vii. 146). The commercial Florentine sees the ruin of France in this ill usage of the Italian bankers. " Onde fu molto ripreso, e d' allora innanzi lo reame di Francia, sempre andò abbassando."

³ Equal, it is calculated, to 72,000 francs, probably much more.

reimburse the loss ; that the royal exchequer would receive the coin at its nominal value ; and even promised to pledge the royal domains as security. But Philip's promises in affairs of money were but specious evasions.¹

As an order, the clergy of France had not been sub-
The clergy. jected to any direct or special taxation under the name of voluntary subsidy ; but Philip had shown on many occasions no pious respect for the goods of the Church ; he had long retained the estates of vacant bishoprics. Their time could not but come. Philip at the beginning of his reign had struck a fatal blow against the clergy, of which the clergy itself, not then ruled by Boniface, perhaps hardly discerned the bearings even on the future inevitable question of their taxation by the state. He banished the clergy from the whole administration of the law : expelled them from the courts, from that time forth to be the special and undisputed domain of their rivals and future foes, the civil lawyers. An Ordinance commanded all dukes, counts, barons, archbishops, bishops, abbots, chapters, who had jurisdiction, to commit the exercise of that jurisdiction to bailiffs, provosts, and assessors, not ecclesiastics. The pretext was specious, that if such men abused their power, they could be punished for the abuse. It was also forbidden to all chapters and monasteries to employ an ecclesiastic as proctor. Another Ordinance deprived the clergy of the right of being elected as provost, mayor, sheriff (*échevin*), or municipal councillor. Bishops could only sit in the Royal Parliament by permission of the President.²

¹ Ordonnances des Rois, May, 1295.

² Ordonnances des Rois, 1287-1289.

Still up to this time the clergy had not been subjected to the common assessments. The first ^{Taxation of clergy.} taxation, which bore the odious name of the maltôte (the ill assessed and ill levied), respected them.¹ It had fallen chiefly, if not exclusively, on the traders. But whether emboldened by the success of his rival Edward in England, or knowing that, if Edward wielded the wealth of the English clergy, he must wield that of France, in the now extraordinary impost the impartial assessment comprehended ecclesiastics as well as the laity.

Boniface VIII., with all his ability and sagacity, was possessed even to infatuation with the conviction of the unlimited, irresistible power of the Papacy. He determined, once for all, on the broadest, boldest, most uncontestable ground to bring to issue this inevitable question ; to sever the property of the Church from all secular obligations ; to declare himself the one exclusive trustee of all the lands, goods, and properties, held throughout Christendom by the clergy, by monastic bodies, even by the universities : and that, without his consent, no aid, benevolence, grant, or subsidy could be raised on their estates or possessions by any temporal sovereign in the world. Such is the full and ^{The Bull "Clericis Laicos."} distinct sense of the famous Bull issued by

Boniface at the commencement of the second year of his Pontificate. "The laity, such is the witness of all antiquity, have been ever hostile to the clergy : recent experience sadly confirms this truth. They are ignorant that over ecclesiastical persons, over ecclesiastical property, they have no power whatever. But they have dared to exact both from the secular and the

¹ Sub ann. 1292.

regular clergy a twentieth, a tenth, half of their revenue,¹ and applied the money to their own secular uses. Some base and time-serving prelates have been so dastardly as to submit to these wicked exactions." The prohibition of the Pope was as particular and explicit as could be framed in words: "On no title, on no plea, under no name, was any tax to be levied on any property of the church, without the distinct permission of the Pope. Every layman of whatever rank, emperor, king, prince, duke, or their officers, who received such money, was at once and absolutely under excommunication; they could only be absolved, under competent authority, at the hour of death. Every ecclesiastic who submitted to such taxation was at once deposed, and incapable of holding any benefice. The universities which should so offend were under interdict."²

But the Kings of France and England were not so easily appalled into acquiescence in a claim which either smote their exchequer with barrenness, or reduced them to dependence not only on their own subjects, but also on the Pope. It gave to the Pontiff of Rome the ultimate judgment on war and peace between nations. Edward had gone too far; he had derived too much advantage from the subsidies of the clergy to abandon that fruitful source of revenue. The year after the levy of one half of the income of the clergy, a Parliament met at St. Edmonds-
England.
A.D. 1296.
Parliament
at Bury.

¹ This seems aimed directly at Edward I. It was believed in England that the bull was obtained by the influence of the English primate, Robert of Winchelsea, then at Rome.

² The bull *Clericis Laicos*, apud Dupuy, *Preuves*, p. 14. In Raynaldus, sub ann. 1296, January, and Rymer, ii. 706.

pleading their inability, as drained by the payment of the last year, or emboldened by the presence of the Primate Robert, of Winchelsea, refused all further grant. The King allowed time for deliberation, but in the mean time with significant precaution ordered locks to be placed on all their barns, and that they should be sealed with the King's seal. The Archbishop at once commanded the Bull of Pope Boniface to be read publicly in all the cathedral churches of the realm; but the barns did not fly open at the bidding of the great enchanter. The Primate summoned a provincial Synod or Convocation of the clergy, to meet in St. ^{Council at} Paul's, London. The King sent an order ^{St. Paul's.} warning the Synod against making any constitution which might infringe on his prerogative, or which might turn to "the disadvantage of us, our ministers, or any of our faithful subjects."¹ The majority of the Synod peremptorily refused all grant or concession. Upon this King Edward took the bold yet tenable ground, that those who would not contribute to the maintenance of the temporal power should not enjoy its protection; if they refused the obligation, they must abandon the rights of subjects. The whole clergy of the realm were declared by the Chief Justice on the Bench to be in a state of outlawry: they had no resort to the King's justice. Nor was this an idle menace. Officers were ordered to seize the best horses both of the secular and regular clergy: if they sought redress, the lawyers were forbidden to plead on their behalf; the King's courts were closed against them. They were now in a perilous and perplexing condition; they must either resist the King or the Pope. They felt the

¹ Spelman, *Concilia*, sub ann.

King's hand; the demand took the form not merely of a subsidy, but of a fine for the contumacious resistance of the King's authority. Yet the terrible anathemas of the Pope's Bull had hardly died away in their cathedrals. There was division among themselves. A great part of the clergy leaned towards the more prudent course, and empowered the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Durham, Salisbury, and Ely to endeavor to ^{They yield.} effect a compromise. A fifth part of their revenue from estates and goods was set apart in some sanctuary or privileged place, to be drawn forth when required by the necessities of the Church or the kingdom. The Papal prohibition was thus, it was thought, eluded: the King, remaining judge of the necessity, cared not, provided he obtained the money.¹ The Primate, as though the shrine of Thomas à Becket spoke warning and encouragement (he knew, too, what

Archbishop
resists. Pope was on the throne), refused all submission, but he stood alone, and alone bore the penalty. His whole estate was seized to the King's use. The Archbishop had but the barren consolation of declaring the rest of the clergy to have incurred the Papal sentence of excommunication. He left the Synod with a solemn admonition to the other Prelates and clergy lest they should imperil their souls by criminal concession. On the other hand, the preaching Friars of the Order of St. Dominic, usually the unscrupulous assertors of the Papal power, appeared in St. Paul's, and offered publicly to maintain the doctrine, that in time of war it was lawful for the clergy to contribute to the necessities of the sovereign. Notwith-

¹ Hemingford, 107, 108. Brady, Appendix, 19, 23. Westminster, ad ann. 1296. Collier, i. 491, &c.

standing the Papal prohibition, the clergy at length yielded, and granted a fourth of their revenue. The Archbishop alone stood firm; but his lands were in the hands of the King's officers; himself an exile from the court. He retired with a single chaplain to a country parsonage, discharged the humble duties of a priest, and lived on the alms of his flock. Lincoln alone followed his conscientious example; Becket and Gros-tête had met together. But Lincoln had generously officious friends, who bought the King's pardon.

The war had now broken out; the King was about to leave the realm, and to embark for Flanders. The King relents. It had been dangerous, if Edward should encounter any of the accidents of war, or be compelled to protracted absence, to leave his young son in the midst of a hostile clergy, and a people imbittered by heavy exactions. Edward restored his barony to the Archbishop, and summoned him to attend a Parliament at Westminster; the Archbishop stood by the side of the young Prince of Wales. The prudent King condescended to an apologetic tone: he lamented that the aggressions of his enemies in France and Scotland had compelled him reluctantly to lay these onerous burdens on his subjects. He was about to expose his life to the chances of war; if God should bless his arms with success, he promised to restore to his people the taxes which he had levied: if he should fall, he commended his young son and heir to their loyal love.¹ The whole assembly was moved; the Archbishop melted into tears. Yet these soft emotions by no means blinded them to the advantage, offered by the occasion, of wresting from the King some further security for their liberties.

¹ Westminster, sub ann. 1297. Hemingford. Knighton.

The two charters, the Great Charter, and that of the Forests, were confirmed, and with them more specific guarantees obtained. All judgments given by the King's justices or ministers of the crown, contrary to the provisions of the charters, were declared null and void.¹ The King commanded that the charters under his seal should be sent to all the cathedral churches in the realm, to be there kept and read in the hearing of the people twice every year. The Archbishops and Prelates at each reading were to declare all who violated these great national statutes by word, deed, or counsel, under actual sentence of excommunication. The Archbishops were to compel by distraint or otherwise the suffragan Prelates who should be remiss in the reiteration of the grave anathemas.²

Thus the clergy of England, abandoning their own ground of ecclesiastical immunities, took shelter under the liberties of the realm. Of these liberties they constituted themselves the guardians; and so shrouded their own exemptions under the general right, now acknowledged, that the subject could not be taxed without his own consent. The Archbishop during the next year published an excommunication in which the rights of the clergy and of the people were blended with consummate skill. It condemned the King's officers who had seized the goods and imprisoned the persons of the clergy (perhaps for the arrears of the subsidy), and at

¹ The Acts in Rymer.

² The civil lawyers, as Sir Edward Coke, maintain that the clergy here acted under the authority and command of the temporal power. High Churchmen, like Collier, insist that the bishops were consenting to the measure; that it was according to the decrees of several provincial councils; that the penalties on refractory prelates were left to the spiritual authority of the archbishops. Compare Collier, i. p. 494.

the same time all who should have violated the charter. It reasserted the immunity of all the King's subjects from taxation to which they had not given their assent. He thus obeyed the royal mandate, aimed a blow at the royal power, and asserted the special exemptions of the clergy.¹

The famous Bull was received in France by the more violent and haughty Philip with still greater indignation; it struck at once at his ^{Bull in} pride, his power, and his cupidity. Philip, in his imperious taxation, had been embarrassed by none of the slow forms, the semblance at least of voluntary grant, to the observance of which the Great Charter, and now usage, had bound the King of England; and which, joined with their own peculiar exemptions, made it necessary that the contributions of the clergy should be voted as an aid, benevolence, or subsidy. Philip, of his sole will, had imposed the tax for the second time (the first was a hundredth of actual property, now a fiftieth), which passed under the detested name of maltôte: the harshness and extortion of his officers, who levied this charge, increased its unpopularity. At first it had been demanded of the merchants, then of all citizens, last of the clergy. But if the wrath of Philip was more vehement, his revenge was more cool and deliberate; it was a retaliation which bore the appearance of moderation, but struck the Popedom deep in the most vital and sensitive part. If the clergy might not be taxed for the exigencies of France, nor might in any way be tributary to the King, France would no longer be tributary to the Pope. From all the kingdoms of Western Christen-

¹ Westm. sub ann. 1298. Collier, i. p. 495. Spelman, Concilia.

dom vast wealth was constantly flowing to Rome ; every great promotion had to pay its fees, no cause could be evoked to Rome without large expenditure in Rome : no pilgrim visited the Eternal City unladen with precious gifts and offerings : the Pope claimed and not seldom had exercised the power of assessing the clergy, not merely for ordinary purposes, but for extraordinary exigencies which concerned the safety or the grandeur of the Pontificate. Philip issued an Ordinance,¹ prohibiting in the most rigid and precise terms the exportation of gold or silver, either in ingots or in plate, of precious stones, of provisions, arms, horses, or munitions of war, of any article, indeed, of current value, without special permission sealed and delivered by the crown.²

Thus, at one blow, Rome was deprived of all her supplies from France. The other Edict, which prohibited foreign trading in the land, proscribed the agents, the bankers, who transmitted in other ways the Papal revenues to Rome. Boniface had gone too far : but it was neither in his character, his station, nor in the interest of the hierarchy, to retract. Yet, he was still true to the old Guelfic policy, close alliance with France. He had espoused the cause of the French

¹ This edict, passed by the King in Parliament, had been preceded and was accompanied by another, prohibiting the entrance of all foreign merchants into the realm, under the strange plea that the internal trade of the country was carried on with sufficient activity by the natives of France. So well indeed had Philip been served by his agents in Rome, that these prohibitory edicts almost, if not quite, anticipated the formal publication of the Papal bull in France.

² The edict, Aug. 17, 1296. Sismondi has mistaken the republication of the bull *Clericis Laicos*, Aug. 18, in France, for the original promulgation in January (*Hist. des Français*, viii. 516). Raynaldus and Dupuy place it in January. It was known in England early in the year. The Pope refers to it in his answer, as the cause of the King's hostile ordinance.

house of Anjou in Naples with ardor. As Pope, he no doubt contemplated with admiration that model of a Christian King, whom he was called upon by the almost adoring voice of Christendom to canonize, Saint Louis. The Empire, though now abased, might rally again, and resume its hostility; the Colonnas were not yet crushed; Ghibellinism not absolutely under his feet. He had, indeed, under the lofty character which he assumed of arbiter of the world, as the Supreme Pontiff, to whom lay resort against all Christian vassals as well as Sovereigns, received the appeal of the Count of Flanders against his liege Lord, Philip of France. Philip, jealous of the design of the Count of Flanders to marry his daughter to the heir of England, had summoned the Count and Countess with their daughter to Paris. They had been treacherously seized; the Count and Countess had escaped, or had been dismissed, but the daughter was kept as a hostage in the power of Philip, who bred her up with his own family. The Count of Flanders complained to the Pope of this injustice. The Pope had sent his Legate, the Bishop of Meaux, to demand her liberation. The only answer was a lofty rebuke to the Pope for presuming to intermeddle with temporal affairs beyond his jurisdiction.¹

Under these conflicting circumstances, Boniface issued his second Manifesto. Never was promulgated by the Papal court a Bull at once so inflexibly imperious, yet so bland; so disguising the haughtiness, the arrogance of a master, under the smooth and gentle language of a parent: so manifestly anxious to conciliate, yet so almost contemptuously offensive. Crimination, expostulation, menace, flattery, explanation bordering

¹ Compare Dupuy and Baillet.

on apology, almost on concession, display the Pope the proudest of mankind, yet for a moment conscious that he is addressing a monarch as proud as himself; determined to assert to the uttermost his immeasurable superiority, and yet modifying, tempering his demands: as the head of the Guelfs, reluctant to alienate the protector of the Guelfic interest. And he is still the head of the great Sacerdotal caste, determined to maintain that caste in its inviolable sanctity and power, and to yield up no letter of the pretensions of his haughtiest ancestors. All the acts of Kings, as moral acts, were under the immediate, indefeasible jurisdiction of the

The Bull.
Sept. 1296.

Pope. "The Church, by the ineffable love of her spouse, Christ, has received the dowry of many precious gifts, especially that great gift of liberty. Who shall presume against God and the Lord to infringe her liberty, and not be beaten down by the hammer of supreme power to dust and ashes? My son! turn not away thine ears from the voice of thy father; his parental language flows from the tenderness of his heart, though with some of the bitterness of past injuries." The Pope throws the whole blame on the King's evil counsellors. "Let him not permit them to change the throne of his glory into a seat of pestilence." "The King's Ordinance to forbid foreigners all traffic in the land, is not less impolitic than unjust. His subjects are oppressed with intolerable burdens; already their alienated loyalty has begun to decay, it will soon be altogether estranged; it is a grievous loss for a King to forfeit the love of his subjects." The Pope will not believe that the general prohibition against all persons quitting the realm, or exporting money or goods, can be intended to apply to ecclesiastics; this would be

worse than impolitic, it would be insane. "Neither thou nor any secular prince hast the power to do this: by the very prohibition is incurred a sentence of excommunication." The Pope reminds the King of the intense anxiety with which he has devoted long days and sleepless nights to his interests; how he has labored to preserve peace, sent his Cardinals to mediate. "Is this the return for the inestimable favors shown by the Church to you and your ancestors?" From the appeal to Philip's gratitude he passes to an appeal to Philip's fears. "Lift up your eyes and look around: the powerful Kings of the Romans, of England, of Spain are in league against you. Is this a time to add the Holy See to your enemies? Let not your insolent counselors drive you to this fatal precipice! Call to mind the goodness of the Holy See, which you may thus compel to abandon you without succor. Call to mind the canonization of your ancestor, Louis, whose miracles the Holy See has examined with assiduous care. Instead of securing, like him, her love, deserve not her indignation. What is the cause of all this? Our Constitution in defence of ecclesiastical liberty? That Constitution asserted only the principles maintained by Popes and Councils; it added the awful penalties of excommunication, because men are more affected by the dread of punishment than by the love of virtue: nor did we by that Constitution precisely ordain that the Prelates and clergy were not to contribute to the necessities of the King; but we declared that this was not to be done without our special permission, bearing in mind the insupportable exactions sometimes wrung from ecclesiastics by the King's officers under his authority. Not only do all divine and human laws, even

judgments, attest the abuse of such authority, but the authority itself is absolutely interdicted; and this we have intimated for the perpetual memory of the truth. If you object that such permission has been petitioned for from the Holy See, and the petition has not been granted," if the realm were in danger, urgent and admitted, the Pope pledged himself to permit not only the levying of taxes, "but the crosses of gold and silver, even the consecrated vessels and furniture of the churches should be sacrificed before a kingdom, so dear to the Apostolic See, should be exposed to peril." "The Constitution did not absolutely prohibit the King from exercising his rights over ecclesiastics who held fiefs of the crown, according to the laws and usages of the realm; but for himself, Boniface was prepared to lay down all, even his life, in defence of the liberties and immunities of the Church against all usurpers whatsoever." He charged the whole guilt of the war on the King of France; it arose from his unjust occupation of Burgundy, an undoubted fief of the Empire, and of Gascony, the inheritance of Edward of England, as Duke of Guienne. On the evils of war he enlarged: peril to the souls of men, the slaughter, the bottomless gulf of expenditure, the damage, arising from the usurpations suggested by his evil counsellors. Those wrongs against the Kings of the Romans and of England were sins, therefore, undoubtedly under the jurisdiction of the Pope;¹ in such aggressions the Pope had full power of judgment. It was shameful for Philip to refuse the mediation, which had been accepted by the King of the Romans and the King of

¹ "Dumque in eos super iis *peccare* te asserunt de hoc iudicium ad Sedem eandem non est dubium pertinere."

England. The Pope would not proceed at once to the last extremity ; he would first attempt the ways of remonstrance and gentleness ; and for this end he had sent the Bishop of Viviers to explain more fully his determination.¹

The King of France promulgated an answer, full, not too long, but in language well considered, and of singular force and strength. This ^{Answer of the King.} document showed the progress of the human mind, and manifestly divulged the new power, that of the civil lawyers, whose style and phrases appear throughout. It began with the bold historic assertion, not only of the superior antiquity of the temporal to the spiritual power in Europe ; but that before there were ecclesiastics in the world the Kings of France had the supreme guardianship of the realm, with full authority to enact all such ordinances as might be for the public weal. "The King, therefore, had prohibited the exportation of arms, provisions, and other things which might be turned to the advantage of his enemies." But this prohibition was not absolute (he turned the Pope's evasions on the Pope), "it required for such exportation the special license of the King. Such license would not have been refused to ecclesiastics, if they were sure that what they exported was their own property, and could not be applied to the damage of the realm." The King glanced with covert sarcasm at the partiality of the Pope. "That other most dear son of the Church (the King of England) had been allowed to seize the goods of the clergy, to imprison the clergy, and yet no excommunication had been pronounced against him." The proclamation proceeded daringly to grapple with

¹ The document in Dupuy, &c.

the vital question. It denied the right of the clergy to the exclusive appellation of "the Church." The laity were as much members of Christ's mystical body as the clergy. The clergy had no special liberty; this was an usurpation on the common rights of all the faithful. The liberty which Christ had obtained belonged to the layman as well as to the ecclesiastic. "Did Christ die and rise again for the clergy alone?" There were, indeed, peculiar liberties, according to the Statutes of the Roman Pontiffs, but these had been granted or permitted by the Roman Emperors. "Such liberties, so granted or permitted, cannot take away the rights of Kings to provide, with the advice of their Parliament, all things necessary for the defence of the realm, according to the eternal rule: Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. All alike, clerks and laymen, nobles and subjects, are bound to the common defence. Such charges are not to be called exactions, extortions, burdens. They are subsidies to the Sovereign for the general protection. The property of the Church in time of war is exposed to more than ordinary dangers. To refuse to contribute to the exigencies of the war, is to refuse due payment to your protectors."

"What wise and intelligent man is not in utter amazement when he hears the Vicar of Christ prohibiting and fulminating his anathema against contributions for the defence of the realm, according to a fair equal rate, for the defence of the clergy themselves? They may give to stage-players; they have full and unbounded license to lavish any expenditure, to the neglect of their churches, on their dress, their horses, their assemblies, their banquets, and all other secular pomps and pleasures. What sane men would forbid,

under the sentence of anathema, that the clergy, crammed, fattened, swollen by the devotion of Princes, should assist the same Princes by aids and subsidies against the persecutions of their foes? Have they not the discernment to see that this inhibition, this refusal is little less than high-treason, condemned by the laws of God and man? It is aiding and abetting the King's enemies, it is treachery to the defenders of the common weal. We, like our forefathers, have ever paid due reverence to God, to his Catholic Church, and his ministers, but we fear not the unjust and immeasurable threats of men." He proceeds to justify the war. "The King of England had refused allegiance for his fiefs held of the crown of France. Ample satisfaction, and fair terms of peace, had been offered to the King of the Romans." The county of Burgundy the King of France held by right of conquest in open war, after defiance and proclamation of hostilities by the King of the Romans himself. "We therefore ought no longer to be provoked by insults, but, as dutiful sons of the Church, to be looked upon with favor, and consoled in our dangers and distresses."¹

The Pope thought it not prudent to contest these broad and bold principles of temporal supremacy; he was now involved in the internecine Feb. 7, 1297. strife with the Colonnas. An address in a milder tone, in which protestations of regard and esteem predominated over the few lingering words of menace, declared that a more harsh, strict, and rigorous meaning than he had designed had been attributed by the malignity and cunning of evil counsellors to the Papal Bull. The Cardinal Legates, however, were commanded to

¹ Document in Dupuy.

raise all moneys due to the Pope; and if the King's officers should interfere with their transmission, they were without hesitation or delay to pronounce sentence of excommunication against those officers.¹ The Pope found himself deserted in France by his natural allies. In the Gallican Church, either national pride triumphed over the hierarchical spirit, or the clergy feared the King more than the Pope. The Archbishop of Rheims, with nothing of the stubborn boldness of Becket, or even the passive courage of Robert of Winchelsea, sent a strong though humble address to the Pope, expressing profound gratitude for his care of the ecclesiastical liberties, but acknowledging their obligations both as feudatories of the King and as subjects, and their duty, in self-defence, to contribute to the public service: they deprecated the Pope's proceedings as disturbing the peace which happily prevailed between the Church of France and the King and Parliament of France.²

For once the haughty Boniface listened to the admonitions of prudence. The King of France, by suspending for a time the operations of his hostile ordinance, gave the Pope an opportunity of withdrawing with less loss of dignity from his dangerous position. Another Bull appeared. "The author," it declared, "of every law is the sole interpreter of that law;" and the interpretation which it now pleased Pope Boniface to give to his famous Bull, virtually abrogated it as regarded the kingdom of France. The King had full right to command the service of all his feudatories, whether holding secular or ecclesiastical fiefs: aids, benevolences, or loans might be granted,

Conduct of
the French
clergy.

Prudence of
Boniface.

¹ Dupuy, Feb. 3.

² Dupuy, p. 26.

provided there was no exaction, only a friendly and gentle requisition from the King's courts. If the realm was in danger, equal taxes might be assessed on all alike; it was left to the conscience of the King, if of full age, during the King's nonage to the prelates, princes, dukes, and counts of the realm, to decide when the state was in danger.¹

The successes of Philip the Fair in negotiation as well as in war, no doubt, if they did not awe the Pope, showed the danger as well as the ^{The war.} 1297, 1298. impolicy of alienating the old true ally of the Pope-dom, now rising to increased power and influence. For his dictatorial injunctions to make peace had been utterly disregarded by all parties; the truce, which he had ordered for two years, had not been observed for as many months.

It was a powerful league which had been organized by the lavish subsidies of England. It comprehended the King of the Romans, Guy Dampierre, Count of Flanders, who hoped to compel the King of France to release his daughter, the Count of Bar, the Duke of Brabant, the Counts of Hainault and Gueldres, the Bishops of Liège and Utrecht, the Archbishop of Cologne. The Counts of Auxerre, Montbelliard, and other nobles of that province engaged, on the receipt of thirty thousand livres, to make a revolt in Burgundy. The more remote Counts of Savoy and Grandson were pledged to encourage and maintain this revolt. So utterly and almost contumeliously were the pacific views of the Pope disregarded in all quarters. But in the mean time Philip had won over the Duke of Bretagne from the English league. In all parts his subsi-

¹ Apud Dupuy, p. 39.

dies counteracted those of England ; subsidies on both sides largely drawn from the ecclesiastical revenues. He had entered Flanders. Charles of Valois had inflicted a severe defeat on the rebels, so the Flemings in the army of the Count Dampierre were called. The rich manufacturing cities, indignant at former attempts of their liege Lord, the Count of Flanders, to infringe their privileges, opened their gates to Philip as their Suzerain. The Count in vain attempted to retrace his steps ; they would not trust him, and were at least indifferent to their change of masters.

Edward had at length disembarked to the relief of his overwhelmed ally.¹ But the forces of the King of England were unequal to the contest. The war in defence of his foreign dominions had been unpopular in England. The English nobles, become more inflexibly insular in their feelings, had more than once refused to follow their monarch for the defence or reconquest of Gascony. In small numbers and with reluctance they had accompanied him to the Flemish shores. Edward's own military skill and vigor seemed to have deserted him : he was forced to abandon Bruges, which opened its gates to the conqueror. Ghent was hardly safe.²

These unusual efforts had exhausted the resources of both kingdoms. The means of prosecuting the war could only be wrung by force from murmuring and refractory subjects, the clergy as well as the laity. There was a limit not only to the endurance, but to the possibility of raising new taxes ; and that limit had been reached both in England and France.

¹ He embarked at Winchelsea, Aug. 22 ; landed at Sluys, 1297. Rymer.

² The war in the English and French historians ; plainly and briefly in Rapin.

At the close of the year the Kings consented to a short truce. News from England, during the A.D. 1297. suspension of arms, disconcerted the plans of Edward for the reorganization in greater strength and activity of his wide-spread league. All Scotland was in revolt. Wallace, from a wild adventurer, at the head of a loose band of moss-troopers, had assumed, in a Parliament at Perth, the title of guardian of the realm and general of the armies of Scotland. Warenne, Earl of Surrey, Edward's Lieutenant, had been reduced to act on the defensive. The Scots were ravaging Cumberland and Westmoreland.

Boniface found these two haughty monarchs, who had so short a time before contemptuously spurned his mediation, one of them, if not imploring, making direct overtures in the most submissive terms for his interposition; the other accepting it with undisguised satisfaction. Edward despatched his ambassadors to Rome, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Durham, the Count of Savoy, Sir Otho Grandison, Sir Hugh de Vere (the Bishop of Winchester was then at Rome), to request the arbitration of his Holiness.¹ The King of France was not averse to peace. He had gained fame, territory, power, and vengeance against some of his more dangerous and disaffected vassals. The Pope had already, by abrogating or mitigating his obnoxious Bull as regarded France, by the solemn act of the canonization of St. Louis, shown his disposition to return to the old Papal policy, close alliance with France. Philip acceded to the arbitration not of the Pope (for both monarchs endeavored to save their honor and the independence of their realms, and to Boniface
arbitrator.

¹ New Rymer, p. 808. See the *Submissio Specialis*, p. 809.

preclude a dangerous precedent), but of Boniface in his private character.¹ Benedetto Gaetani was the appointed arbiter. This subtile distinction Boniface was wise enough to permit and to despise: the world saw the two great Kings at his feet, awaiting his award, and in that award the full virtual recognition of the Papal arbitration. The contested territories could be sequestered, as they were for a time, only into the hands of the Pope's officers, not those of Benedetto Gaetani.

The extraordinary despatch with which this important treaty was framed, the equity of its provisions, the unreserved if on one side angry and reluctant assent of the contending parties,² could not but raise the general opinion of the Papal authority. Erelong the King of France had acquiesced in the decree.³ The treaty seemed to aim at the establishment of lasting peace between the two rival powers by a double marriage between the houses, that of Edward himself with Margaret the sister, of the younger Edward with Isabella, daughter of the King of France.⁴

¹ As regards France, this condition may appear the subtile and provident invention of the lawyers. They would not admit, even in terms, that superiority which the See of Rome grounded on precedents as feudal lord of England, Scotland, Sicily, Arragon, Hungary; nor even that more vague superiority over the King of Germany, as King of the Romans and claimant of the empire.

² The agreement was signed at Rome, June 14, 1298. The instrument in Rymer is dated June 27. The tone of the King of England is far more submissive than that of the King of France. Compare the two documents in Rymer. The nobles of Burgundy, the allies of Edward, Montbelliard, D'Arlay, Montfaucon, sent ambassadors to represent them in the treaty. The Count of Flanders and Edward's other continental allies acceded to the arbitration of Benedetto Gaetani.

³ See p. 301.

⁴ The Pope annulled all the engagements, obligations, and oaths entered into by Edward to marry his son to the daughter of the Count of Flanders. — Rymer, p. 188.

But so completely was the Pope inseparable from Benedetto Gaetani, that the penalty imposed, in case either monarch should not fulfil the terms of these marriage-contracts, was an interdict to be laid on their territories. Restitution was to be made on either side of all lands, vessels, merchandise, or goods, still subsisting; compensation according to the same arbitration for those destroyed or damaged during the war. Edward was to receive back, if not wholly, in great part, his fiefs in France, on condition of homage and fealty to his liege Lord; and the Pope became security against his future rebellion. In the mean time till the boundaries could be settled, and all questions of jurisdiction brought to issue, those territories were to be surrendered to the Pope's officers, to be held by the Pope until the final termination of all differences. The arbitration of Benedetto Gaetani was pronounced in full Synod at Rome in the presence of the Cardinals, the Apostolic Notaries, and all the functionaries of the Papal Court. According to the terms of the arbitration, the Bishop of Vicenza took possession in the Pope's name of the province of Guienne.

This was not the only quarrel in which the Pope was invited to take the part of arbiter. The insurgent Scots had recourse to the protection of the Papal See against the tyrannous usurpation of Edward. Their claim to this protection rested not on the general function and duty of the Head of the Christian Church to interpose his good offices in defence of the oppressed, for the maintenance of justice, and the preservation of Christian peace. They appealed to the Pope as their acknowledged liege Lord. Scotland, they said, was a fief of the Church of Rome, and had a right to de-

mand aid against the invader not only of their liberties, but of the Pope's rights. The origin of this claim is obscure, but it was not now heard for the first time. Nor did it seem to rest on the vague and general pretensions of the Pope to the sovereignty over all islands.¹

Already, before this appeal had been publicly received at Rome, Boniface, in the character which he assumed of Pacificator of Christendom, and on the strength of the treaty concluded under his arbitration between France and England, had admonished King Edward not to prosecute the war against the Scots. Edward took no notice of this admonition. His first campaign at the head of the knighthood of England had ended with the total defeat of Wallace, who became again a wandering and almost solitary adventurer. But though he could vanquish, the King of England could not keep possession of the poor territory: and at the close of the campaign most of his forces dispersed and returned to their English homes. A new government had been formed. William Lamberton, Bishop of St. Andrew's, Robert Bruce, and John Comyn proclaimed themselves a Regency in the name of John Baliol, who, though in an English prison, was still held to be the rightful sovereign. Edward's marriage with Margaret of France, the time necessary to reorganize his army, the refusal of the English barons to invade Scotland during the winter, gave the Regency so much leisure to recover their strength, that they ventured to

¹ Compare Lingard's note, vol. iii. c. 3, in which he clearly shows that it had been asserted on more than one occasion. In the MS., B. M. appears this singular ground for the title: "*Præterea nosse potest Regia Celsitudo, qualiter regnum ipsum per beati Andreæ Apostoli venerandas reliquias, non sine superni Dei dono, acquisitum et conversum extitit ad fidei Catholicæ unitatem.*" — Vol. xiv. p. 53, June 27, 1299.

lay siege to the castle of Stirling. But their main hope was in the intervention of the Pope: and the Pope appeared to take up their cause with a vigor, as it were, flushed by the recent submission of Edward. ^{June 27, 1299.} His Bull addressed to the King of England spoke almost the words of the Ambassador of Scotland. It declared that the kingdom of Scotland had belonged in full right to the Church of Rome: that it neither was nor ever had been a fief of the King of England, or of his ancestors. It discussed and disdainfully threw aside all the pretensions of feudal suzerainty adduced by the King of England. It commanded him instantly to release the Bishop of Glasgow, the Bishop of Sodor, and other Scottish ecclesiastics whom he kept in prison; to surrender the castles, and still more the monasteries and religious houses, which he presumed to hold to their damage, in some places to their utter ruin, in the realm of Scotland: to send his Ambassadors within six months to Rome to receive the Pope's determination on all differences between himself and the kingdom of Scotland.

Edward was compelled for a time to dissemble his indignation at this imperious summons. The Bull, to insure its service upon the King, had been committed to Winchelsea, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Primate was commanded, in virtue of his obedience to the Pope, without delay to present this mandate to the King, and use all his authority to induce the King to immediate and unreserved compliance.¹

¹ There is great difficulty about the dates in this affair. The bull and the letter to Winchelsea are dated June, 1299. The Parliament of Lincoln was summoned Sept. 27, 1300; met in 1301. Lingard supposes that the bull, which was only delivered by Winchelsea to the King in Aug. 1300, had been withheld by some *unaccountable* delay from reaching Winchelsea

At this time all civil and religious affairs were suspended ; all thoughts swallowed up, by the great religious movement which, at the close of the century, began in Italy and rapidly drew all Western Christendom within its whirlpool, a vast peaceful Crusade, to Rome not to Jerusalem, by which the spiritual advantages of that remote and armed and perilous pilgrimage were to be attained at much less cost, exertion, and danger. To the calm and philosophic mind the termination of a centenary period in the history of man is an epoch which cannot be contemplated without awe and seriousness ; in those ages awe and seriousness were inseparable from profound, if passionate and unreasoning religion. It is impossible to determine whether a skilful impulse from Rome and from the clergy first kindled this access of fervent devotion. At this period, when Christendom was either seized or inspired with this paroxysm of faith, Palestine was irrevocably lost : the unbelievers were in undisturbed possession of the sepulchre of Christ. But the tombs of the Apostles, of Peter and of Paul, next to that of the Redeemer, the most sacred, and hallowed by their venerable and unquestioned relics, were accessible to all the West. The plenary Indulgences, which had been so lavishly bestowed in the early period of the Crusades, and might, even in the decay of the Crusading passion, be obtained by the desperate and worldly-weary votary, were not now coveted with less ardor.

till towards June 1300. We might perhaps suppose that the jubilee, in its preparations, and in the necessary arrangements, absorbed all the time of the Roman court, and altogether preoccupying the public mind, superseded all other business. But, from the haughty tone and almost menace of the Papal letters to Winchelsea (MS., B. M.), there seems to have been some timid reluctance or delay on the part of the primate.

Would the Church withhold on more easy terms those precious and consolatory privileges for which the world was content to pay by such prodigal oblations, and which were thus the source of inexhaustible power and wealth to the clergy? Christendom was now almost at peace; the Pope's treaty had been respected by France and England, and by their respective allies. Germany reposed under the doubtful supremacy of Albert of Austria. The north of Italy was in outward at least and unwonted peace: the industrious and flourishing republics, the commercial and maritime cities were overflowing with riches, and ready with their lavish tribute.

Already on the first of January of the great centenary year, even before, on the Nativity (1299), the Churches of Rome, it might seem, from a natural, spontaneous, unsuggested, and therefore heaven-inspired thought (the movement was the stronger because no one knew how and where it began), were thronged with thousands supplicating, almost imperiously demanding, what they had been taught or believed to be the customary Indulgences of the season. The most humbly-religious Pope might have rejoiced at that august spectacle of Christendom thus crowding to offer its homage on the tombs of the Apostles, acknowledging Rome as the religious centre of the world, and coming under the personal benediction of the Roman Pontiff. The venerable image of the successor of St. Peter, thus planted in the hearts of so many, who would return home not passive slaves only but ardent assertors of the Papal supremacy, not subjects only but worshippers; the tribute lavished upon the altars — these might be but secondary considerations.

Ambition, pride, and avarice might stand rebuked before nobler, more holy sentiments. Which predominated in the heart of Boniface VIII., shall history, written by human hand, presume to say? If both or either intruded on his serene contemplation of this triumph of the religious element in man, was it the more high and generous, or the more low and sordid? was it haughtiness or rapacity? Assuredly the sagacity of Boniface could not refuse to discern the immediate, and to foresee the remoter consequences of this ceremony: he could not close his eyes on the myriads at his feet: he could not refuse to hear the amount of the treasures which loaded the altars.

The court of Rome, in its solemn respect for precedent, affected to require the sanction of ancient usage for the institution of the Holy year. The Mosaic Law offered its Jubilee, the tradition of the secular games at Rome might lurk to this time at least among the learned, very probably in the habits and customs of the people. The Church had never disdained, rather had avowed, the policy of turning to her own good ends the old Pagan usages. Grave inquiry was instituted. The Cardinal Stefaneschi, the poet-historian, was employed to search the archives: the College of Cardinals were duly consulted. At length the Pope himself ascended the pulpit in St. Peter's. The church was splendidly hung with rich tapestries; it was crowded with eager votaries. After his sermon the Pope unfolded the Bull, which proclaimed the welcome Indulgences, sealed with the pontifical seal. The Bull was immediately promulgated; it asserted the ancient usage of Indulgences to all who should make pilgrimage to the tomb of the "Chief of the Apostles."

The Pope, in his solicitude for the souls of men, by his plenary power, gave to all who during the year should visit once a day the Churches of the Apostles, the Romans for thirty days, strangers for fifteen, and should have repented and confessed, full absolution of all their sins.

All Europe was in a frenzy of religious zeal. Throughout the year the roads in the re- Pilgrims. motest parts of Germany, Hungary, Britain, were crowded with pilgrims of all ages, of both sexes. A Savoyard above one hundred years old determined to see the tombs of the Apostles before he died. There were at times two hundred thousand strangers at Rome. During the year (no doubt the calculations were loose and vague) the city was visited by millions of pilgrims. At one time, so vast was the press both within and without the walls, that openings were broken for ingress and egress. Many people were trampled down, and perished by suffocation. The Papal authorities had taken the wisest and most effective measures against famine for such accumulating multitudes. It was a year of abundant harvest; the territories of Rome and Naples furnished large supplies. Lodgings were exorbitantly dear, forage scarce; but the ordinary food of man, bread, meat, wine, and fish, was sold in great plenty and at moderate prices. The oblations were beyond calculation. It is reported by an eye-witness that two priests stood with rakes in their hands sweeping the uncounted gold and silver from the altars. Nor was this tribute, like offerings or subsidies for Crusades, to be devoted to special uses, the accoutrements, provisions, freight of armies. It was entirely at the free and irresponsible disposal of the Pope. Christen-

dom of its own accord was heaping at the Pope's feet this extraordinary custom:¹ and receiving back the gift of pardon and everlasting life.

But from this great act of amnesty to the whole of Christendom were sternly excluded the enemies of Boniface — the rebels, as they were proclaimed, against the See of Rome — Frederick of Arragon and the Sicilians, the Colonnas, and all who harbored them.

¹ Stefaneschi. Villani, *Istorie Fiorent.* viii. 36. Ventura. After all, this mode of collecting does not, with the explanation of the Cardinal-poet, necessarily imply a contribution so very enormous. The text of Stefaneschi is unfortunately imperfect. He seems to say that the usual annual offerings on the tombs of the Apostles amounted to 30,000 florins; this year to 50,000 more, chiefly in small coins of all countries. Many were too poor to make any offering. The Cardinal contrasts the conduct of these humble votaries with that of the kings, who, unlike the Three of old, so munificent at the feet of the infant Jesus, were parsimonious in their offerings to Jesus at the right hand of the Father. "Instead of this, they seize the tithes of the churches bestowed by their generous ancestors, whose glory becomes their shame." Villani, himself a pilgrim (did the rich Florentines pay handsomely?), notes the vast wealth gained by the Romans as well as by the Church; according to his strong expression, almost all Christendom went. Villani drew his historic inspiration from his pilgrimage. His admiration of the great and ancient monuments of Rome, recorded by Virgil, Sallust, Lucan, Titus Livius, Valerius, and Orosius, led him, an unworthy disciple, to attempt to write history in their style. Villani is far from Livy, or even Sallust; but he might hold his own before Valerius and Orosius.

CHAPTER IX.

BONIFACE VIII. HIS FALL.

THIS centenary year, illustrated by the splendid festival of the Jubilee, and this homage and Boniface at the height of his power. tribute paid by several millions of worshippers to the representative of St. Peter, was the zenith of the fame and power of Boniface VIII., perhaps of the Roman Pontificate. So far his immeasurable pretensions, if they had encountered resistance, had suffered no humiliating rebuke. Christendom might seem, by its submission, as if conspiring to intoxicate all his ruling passions, to tempt his ambition, to swell his pride, to glut his rapacity. The Colonnas, his redoubted enemies, were crushed; they were exiles in distant lands; it might seem superfluous hatred to confer on them the distinction of exclusion from the benefits of the Jubilee. Sicily, he might hope, would not long continue her unfilial rebellion. Roger Loria, now on the Angevine side, had gained one of his famous victories over the Arragonese fleet. Already Boniface had determined in his mind that great, though eventually fatal scheme by which Charles of Valois, who in the plains of Flanders had gained distinguished reputation in arms, should descend the Alps as the soldier of the Pope, and terminate at once the obstinate war. Sicily reduced, Charles of Valois, married to the heiress of

the Latin Emperor Baldwin, was to win back the imperial throne of Constantinople to the dominion of the West, and to its spiritual allegiance under the Roman See. Boniface had interposed to regulate the succession to the crown of Hungary: Hungary had received a king at his bidding.¹ The King of the Romans, Albert of Austria, was under his ban as a rebel, and even as the murderer, so he was denounced, of his sovereign, Adolph of Nassau. Absolution for these crimes could only be given by the Pope himself, and Albert would doubtless purchase at any price that spiritual pardon without which his throne trembled under him. The two mighty Kings of France and England, who once spurned, had now been reduced to accept his mediation. He held, as arbiter, the province of Guienne. Scotland, to escape English rule, had declared herself a fief of the Apostolic See. Edward had not yet ventured to treat with scorn the strange demand of implicit submission, in all differences between himself and the Scots, to the Papal judgment. The embers of that fatal controversy between the King of France and Boniface, which were hereafter to blaze out into such ruinous conflagration, were smouldering unregarded, and to all seeming entirely extinguished. Philip, the brother of Charles of Valois, might appear the dearest and most obedient son of the Church.

But even at this time, in the depths and on the heights of the Christian world, influences were at work not only about to become fatal to the worldly grandeur of Boniface and to his life, but to his fame to the latest ages. Boniface was hated with a sincerity and intensity of hatred which, if it darkened, cannot be rejected

¹ Mailath, *Geschichte der Magyaren*, ii. p. 5, *et seq.*

as a witness against his vices, his overweening arrogance, his treachery, his avidity.

The Franciscans throughout Christendom, more especially in Italy, had the strongest hold on the popular mind. Their brotherhood was vigorous enough not to be weakened by the great internal schism which had begun to manifest itself from their foundation.¹ But to both the factions in this powerful order, up to near this time among the vehement and passionate teachers of the humblest submission to the Papacy, the present Pontiff was equally odious. In all lands the Franciscans were followed and embarrassed by the insoluble, interminable question, the possession of property, a question hereafter to be even more fiercely agitated. How could the Franciscans not yield to the temptation of the wealth which, as formerly with other Orders, the devotion of mankind now cast at their feet? The inveterate feeling of the possibility of propitiating the Deity by munificent gifts, of atoning for a life of violence and guilt by the lavish donation or bequest, made it difficult for those who held dominion over men's minds as spiritual counsellors, to refuse to accept as stewards, to be the receivers, as it were, for God, of those oblations, ever more frequent and splendid according to the depth and energy of the religious impressions which they had awakened. From stewards to become owners; from dispensers or trustees, and sometimes venders of lands or goods bequeathed to pious uses, in order to distribute the proceeds among the poor or on religious edifices, to be the lords, and so, as they might fondly delude themselves, the more pru-

¹ See back the succession of Generals, Elias, Crescentius, John of Parma, Bonaventura, p. 72.

dent and economic managers of such estates, was but an easy and unperceived transition. Hence, if not from more sordid causes, in defiance of the vow of absolute poverty, the primal law of the society, the Franciscans now vied in wealth with the older and less rigorous orders.¹ Mendicancy, their vital principle, had long ceased to be content with the scanty boon of hard fare and coarse clothing; it grasped at lands and the cost at least of splendid buildings. But the stern and inflexible statute of the order stood in their way; the Pope alone could annul that primary disqualification to hold lands and other property. To abrogate this inconvenient rule, to enlarge the narrow vow, had now become the aim of the most powerful, and, because most powerful, most wealthy Minorites. But Boniface was inexorable. On the Franciscans of England he practised a most unworthy fraud; and, bound together as the Order was throughout Christendom, such an act would produce its effect throughout the whole republic of the Minorites. The crafty avarice of the Pope was too much for the simple avarice of the Order. They offered to deposit forty thousand ducats with certain bankers, as the price of the Papal permission to hold lands. The Pope appeared to listen favorably till the money was in the bankers' hands. He then discovered that the concession was in direct opposition to the fundamental laws of the Order, and to the will of the seraphic Francis; but as they could not hold property, the property in the bankers' hands could not be theirs. He absolved the bankers from their obligation to repay the Franciscans, and seized for his

¹ Westminster says that it was rumored that the Statute of Mortmain was chiefly aimed at restraining the avidity of the Franciscans. — v. p. 495.

proper use the unowned treasures. It was a bold and desperate measure, even in a Pope, a Pope with the power and authority of Boniface, to estrange the loyalty of the Minorites, dispersed, but in strict union, throughout the world, and now in command not merely of the popular mind, but of the profoundest theology of the age.

But if the higher Franciscans might thus be disposed to taunt the rapacity of Boniface, which had baffled their own, and throughout the Order might prevail a brooding and unavowed hostility to the intractable Pontiff; it was worse among the lower Franciscans, who had begun to draw off into a separate and inimical community. These were already under dark suspicions of heresy, and of belief in prophecies (hereafter to be more fully shown¹), no less hostile to the whole hierarchical system than the tenets of the Albigensians, or of the followers of Peter Waldo. To them Boniface was, if not the Antichrist, hardly less an object of devout abhorrence. To the Fraticelli, Cœlestine was ever the model Pope. The Cœlestinians had either blended with the Fraticelli, or were bound to them by the closest sympathies. With them, Boniface was still an usurper who disgraced the throne which he had obtained through lawless craft and violence, by the maintenance of an iniquitous, unchristian system, a system implacably irreconcilable with Apostolic poverty, and therefore with Apostolic faith. The Fraticelli, or Cœlestinians, as has been seen, had their poet; and perhaps the rude rhymes of Jacopone da Todi, to the tunes and in the rhythm of much of the popular hymnology,

¹ We must await the pontificate of John XXII. for the full development of their tenets.

sounded more powerfully in the ears of men, stirred with no less fire the hearts of his simpler hearers, than in later days the sublime *terzains* of Dante. Jacopone da Todi was a lawyer, of a gay and jovial life. His wife, of exquisite beauty and of noble birth, was deeply religious. During a solemn festival in the church, she fell on the pavement from a scaffold. Jacopone rushed to loosen her dress; the dying woman struggled with more than feminine modesty; she was found swathed in the coarsest sackcloth. Jacopone at once renounced the world, and became a Franciscan tertiary; in the rigor of his asceticism, in the sternness of his opinions, a true brother of the most extreme of the *Fratricelli*. We have heard Jacopone admonish Cœlestine: his rude verse was no less bold against Boniface.¹

Boniface pursued the *Fratricelli*, whose dangerous doctrines his well-informed sagacity could not but follow out to their inevitable conclusions; ² even if they had not yet announced that coming reign of the Holy Spirit, which was to supersede and sweep away all the hierarchy. He could hardly be ignorant of their menacing prophecies. He cut off at once this rebellious branch from the body of the faithful, and denounced them as obstinate irreclaimable heretics.³ Jacopone,

¹ A poem has disappeared from the later editions:—

“O Papa Bonifazio
Molto hai giocato al mondo,
Penso che giocando
Non te parria partire.”

This is genuine Jacopone. Two stanzas, alluding to the scene at Anagni, seem of a more doubtful hand.—Note to the German translation of Ozanam on the Religious Poets of Italy, by Dr. Julius, p. 188.

² Compare Ferretus Vicentinus, end of second book, character of Boniface.

³ On the *Fratricelli*, Raynaldus, p. 240. In the bull of Boniface against

not without cause (he had been the secretary in that league of the Colonnas and the ecclesiastics of France), became an object of persecution; that persecution, as usual, only gave him the honor and increasing influence of a martyr; his verses were hardly less bold, and were more endeared to the passions, and sunk deeper into the hearts of men.¹

A Pope of a Ghibelline family, an apostate, as he was justly or unjustly thought, who had carried Guelfism to an unprecedented height of arrogance, and enforced its triumph with remorseless severity, centred of course on himself the detestation of all true Ghibellines. He had trampled down, but not exterminated, the Colonnas; their dispersion, if less dangerous to his power, was more dangerous to his fame. Wherever they went they spread the most hateful stories of his pride, perfidy, cruelty, avarice, so that even now we cannot discriminate darkened truth from baseless calumny. The greedy ears of the Ghibellines throughout Italy, of his enemies throughout Christendom, drank in and gave further currency to these sinister and rankling antipathies.

But the measure by which Boniface hoped almost to exterminate Ghibellinism, by placing on the throne of Naples a powerful monarch, instead of the feeble representative of the old Angevine line, thus wresting Sicily forever from the house of Arragon, and so putting an

them, he is extremely indignant at their apostasy. They averred "*quod tempore interdicti melius quam alio tempore sit eisdem, et quod propter excommunicationem cibus non minus sapidus sit temporalis, nec minus bene dormiunt propterea.*" — p. 242.

¹ There is to my ear a bitter and insulting tone in the two satires written from his prison, in which he seems to supplicate, and at the same time to treat the Papal absolution as indifferent to one so full as he was of hatred of himself and love of Christ. — Satire xvii. xix.

end to the war, was most disastrous to his peace and to his fame. The invitation of Charles of Valois to be the soldier, protector, ally of the Pope, ended in revolting half Italy, while it had not the slightest effect in mitigating the subsequent fatal collision with France. Had Charles of Valois never trampled on the liberties of Florence, Dante might never have fallen off to Ghibellinism, he might have been silent of the fate of Boniface in hell. Hardly had Charles of Valois descended into Italy, when Boniface could not disguise to himself that he had introduced a master instead of a vassal. The haughty Frenchman paid as little respect, in his inordinate ambition, to the counsels, admonitions, remonstrances of the Pope, as to the liberties of the Italian people, or the laws of justice, humanity, or good faith. The summary of Charles of Valois' expedition into Italy, the expedition of the lieutenant and peacemaker of the Pope, was contained in that sarcastic sentence alluded to above, "He came to establish peace in Tuscany, and left war; he went to Sicily to wage war, and made a disgraceful peace." Through Charles of Valois the Pope became an object of execration in Florence, of mistrust and hatred throughout Italy; the anathematized Frederick obtained full possession of Sicily for his life, and as much longer as his descendants could hold it.¹ It were perhaps hard to determine which of the two brothers shook the power, and made the name of Boniface more odious to mankind, his friend and ally Charles of Valois, or his foe Philip the Fair.

The arrogant interposition of the Pope in the affairs of Scotland was rejected, not only by the

¹ See before, p. 221.

King but by the English nation. The Parliament met at Lincoln. There assembled one hundred and four of the greatest barons of the Parliament of Lincoln. A.D. 1301. realm, among the first, Bohun, Earl of Hereford, and Bigod, Earl of Norfolk,¹ whose bold opposition had compelled the King to sign the two charters, with additional securities for the protection of the subject against the power of the Crown; they had joined with the Archbishop to resist the exactions of the King. The Universities sent their most distinguished doctors of civil law; the monasteries had been ordered to furnish all documents which could throw light on the controversy. The answer to the Pope's Bull, agreed on after some discussion, was signed by all the Nobles. It expressed the amazement of the Lords in Parliament at the unheard-of pretensions advanced in the Papal Bull, asserted the immemorial supremacy of the King of England over the King of Scotland in the times of the Britons and of the Saxons. Scotland had never paid feudal allegiance to the Church. The King of England is in no way accountable or amenable to the jurisdiction of the Pope for his rights over the kingdom of Scotland; he must not permit those rights to be called in question. It would be a disinheritation of the crown of England and of the royal dignity, a subversion of the state of England, if the King should appear by his proctors or ambassadors to plead on those rights in the Court of Rome; an infringement of the ancient liberties, customs, and laws of the realm, "to

¹ It was Bigod who refused to attend the King as Earl Marshal to Flanders. "By the everlasting God," said Edward, "Sir Earl, you shall go or hang." "By the everlasting God," answered Bigod, "I will neither go nor hang."

the maintenance of which we are bound by a solemn oath, and which by God's grace we will maintain to the utmost of our power, and with our whole strength. We neither permit, nor will we permit (we have neither the will nor the power to do so) our Lord the King, even if he should so design to comply, or attempt compliance, with demands so unprecedented, so unlawful, so prejudicial, so unheard of. Wherefore we humbly and earnestly beseech your Holiness to leave our King, a true Catholic, and devotedly attached to the Church of Rome, in peaceful and undisturbed possession of all his rights, liberties, customs, and laws."¹

King Edward, however, to quiet the conscience of the Pope, not, as he distinctly declared, as submitting to his judgment, condescended to make a full and elaborate statement of his title to the homage of Scotland, in a document which seemed to presume on the ignorance or credulity of his Holiness as to the history of England and of the world, with boldness only equalled by the counter-statements of the Scottish Regency. It is a singular illustration of the state of human knowledge when poetry and history are one, when the mythic and historic have the same authority even as to grave legal claims, and questions affecting the destinies of nations.

The origin of the King of England's supremacy
Claims of
England. over Scotland mounts almost to immemorial
 antiquity. Brute, the Trojan, in the days of
 Eli and Samuel, conquered the island of Albion from
 the Giants. He divided it among his three sons, Lo-
 crine, Albanact, and Camber. Albanact was slain in

¹ Rymer, dated Feb. 12, 1301.

battle by a foreign invader, Humber. Locrine avenged his death, slew the usurper, who was drowned in the river which took his name, and subjected the realm of Albanact (Scotland) to that of Britain. Of the two sons of Dunwallo, King of Britain, Belinus and Brennus, Belinus received the kingdom of Britain, Brennus that of Scotland, under his brother, according to the Trojan law of primogeniture. King Arthur bestowed the kingdom of Scotland on Angusil, who bore Arthur's sword before him in sign of fealty. So, throughout the Saxon race, almost every famous King, from Athelstan to Edward the Confessor, had either appointed Kings of Scotland or received homage from them. The Normans exercised the same supremacy, from William the Conqueror to King Edward's father, Henry III. The King dauntlessly relates acts of submission and fealty from all the Scottish Kings. He concludes this long and labored manifesto with the assertion of his full, absolute, indefeasible title to the kingdom of Scotland, as well in right of property, as of possession ; and that he will neither do any act, nor give any security, which will in the least derogate from that right and that possession.

The Pope received this extraordinary statement with consummate solemnity. He handed it over Answer of the Scots. to Baldred Basset, the Envoy of the Scottish Regency. In due time appeared the answer, which, with the same grave unsuspectingness, meets the King on his own ground. The Scots had their legend, which for this purpose becomes equally authentic history. They deny not Brute or his conquest ; but they hold their independent descent from Scota, the daughter of Pharaoh, King of Egypt, who sojourned at Athens and

subdued Ireland. Her sons conquered Scotland from the degenerate race of Brute. The Saxon supremacy, if there were such supremacy, is no precedent for Edward, a descendant of Norman kings. No act of homage was ever performed to them by any King of Scotland, but by William the Lion, and that for lands held within the kingdom of England. They assert the absolute jurisdiction of the court of Rome. Edward, did he not mistrust his cause, could not decline that just and infallible tribunal. Scotland is, and ever has been, an allodial fief, an inalienable possession of the Church of Rome. It was contained in the universal grant of Constantine the Emperor, of all islands in the ocean to the successors of St. Peter.¹

But these more remote controversies were now to be
Quarrel with France. drowned in the din of that absorbing strife, on which Christendom gazed in silent amazement, the quarrel between the Pope and the King of France. Boniface must descend from his tranquil eminence, as dictator of peace, as arbiter between contending Kings, to a long furious altercation of royal Edicts and Papal Bulls, in which, if not all respect for the Roman See, at least for himself was thrown aside; in which, if not his life, his power and his personal liberty were openly menaced; in which on his side he threatened to excommunicate, to depose by some powerful league the greatest monarch in Europe, and was himself summoned to appear before a General Council to answer for the most monstrous crimes. The strife closed with his seizure in his own palace, and in his hastened death.

As this strife with France became more violent, the

¹ Rymer. On the Scotch plea compare Fordun, Scoti Chronicon.

King of England, whom each party would fear to offend, calmly pursued his plans of security and aggrandizement. The rights of the Roman See to the fief of Scotland quietly sunk into oblivion; the liberties of the oppressed Scots ceased to awaken the sympathies of their spiritual vindicator. The change in the views of the Pope was complete; his inactivity in the cause of the Scots grew into indirect support of the King of England. In an extant Bull he reproves the Archbishop of Glasgow and other Prelates of Scotland, for their obstinate maintenance of an unnatural rebellion: he treats them as acting unworthily of their holy calling, and threatens them with condign censure; those very Prelates for whose imprisonment he had condemned the King of England.¹

The Pope and
the King
abandon
their ally.

Nor was Philip less disposed to abandon the Scottish insurgents to their fate. After obtaining for them the short truce of Angers, he no longer interposed in their behalf. There might almost seem a tacit understanding between the Kings. Edward, in like manner, forgot his faithful ally the Count of Flanders, who was confined in a French prison as a rebellious vassal. He did not insist on his liberation, it does not appear that he even remonstrated against this humiliating wrong.

The quarrel between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair is one of the great epochs in the Papal history, the turning point after which, for a time at least, the Papacy sank with a swift and precipitate descent, and from which it never rose again to the same commanding height. It led rapidly, if not directly and immediately, to that debasing period which has been called

¹ Rymer.

the Babylonian captivity of the Popes in Avignon, during which they became not much more than the slaves of the Kings of France. It was the strife of the two proudest, hardest, and least conciliatory of men, in defence of the two most stubbornly irreconcilable principles which could be brought into collision, with everything to exasperate, nothing to avert, to break, or to mitigate the shock.

The causes which led more immediately to this disastrous discord seem petty and insignificant; but when two violent, ambitious, and unyielding men are opposed, each strenuous in the assertion of incompatible claims, small causes provoke and irritate the feud, more perhaps than some one great object of contest. The clergy of France had many grievances, complained of many usurpations on the part of Philip, his family, and his officers, which were duly brought before the Papal court. The Bishop of Laon had been suspended from his spiritual functions by the Pope; he was cited to Rome. The King sequestered and took possession of the lands and goods as of a vacant See. John, Cardinal of St. Cecilia, had devised certain estates which he held in France for the endowment of a college for poor clerks in Paris. Philip, it is not known on what plea, seized the lands, and refused to restore them, though admonished by the Pope. Robert of Artois, the King's brother, claimed against the Bishop part of the city of Cambrai: he continued to hold it in defiance of the Papal censure. The Archbishop of Rheims complained that his estates, sequestered by the King for his own use during the vacancy of the See, had not been fully restored to the Archiepiscopate. The Archbishop of Narbonne was involved in two disputes, one with the

Viscount of that city, who claimed to hold his castle in Narbonne of the King, not of the Archbishop, who had received, as was asserted on the other hand, the homage and fealty of his father. A Council was held at Beziers on the subject: and an appeal made to Paris. The second feud related to the district of Maguelone, which the officers of St. Louis had usurped from the See of Narbonne; but on an appeal to Clement IV., it had been ceded back to the Church. The officers of Philip were again in possession of Maguelone. On this subject came a strong, but not intemperate remonstrance from the Pope, yet in which might be heard the first faint murmurs of the brooding storm. The Pope naturally set before the King the example of his pious and sainted grandsire Louis. That canonization is always represented as an act of condescending favor, not as a right extorted by the unquestioned virtues and acknowledged miracles of St. Louis; and as binding the kingdom of France, especially his descendants on the throne, in an irredeemable debt of gratitude to the Holy See. "The Pope cannot overlook such aggressions as those of the King on the rights of the Archbishop of Narbonne without incurring the blame of dumb dogs, who dare not bark;" he warns the King against the false prophets with honeyed lips, the evil counsellors, the extent of whose fatal influence he already, no doubt, dimly foresaw, the lawyers, on whom the King depended in all his acts, whether for the maintenance of his own rights, or the usurpation of those of others.

As yet there was no open breach. No doubt the recollection of the former feud rankled in the hearts of both. The unmeasured pretensions of the Pope in

the Bull which exempted the clergy altogether from taxation for the state had not been rescinded, only mitigated as regarded France. All these smaller vexatious acts of rapacity showed that the King was actuated by the same spirit, which would proceed to any extremity rather than yield this prerogative of his crown.

The dissatisfaction of Philip with the arbitration of Boniface between France and England; his indignation that the arbitrament, which had been referred to Benedetto Gaetani, not to Pope Boniface, had been published in the form of a Bull; the fury into which the King and the nobles were betrayed by the articles concerning the Count of Flanders, rest on no extant contemporary authority; yet are so particular and so characteristic that it is difficult to ascribe them to the invention of the French historians.¹ It is said that the Bull, which had been ostentatiously read before a great public assembly in the Vatican, was presented to the King of France by an English prelate, the Bishop of Durham, as Papal Legate for that purpose, as well as ambassador of England; that besides the articles of peace between France and England, it ordered the King to surrender to the Count of Flanders all the cities which he had taken during the war, to deliver up his daughter, who had been a prisoner in France during two years, and to allow the Count of Flanders to

¹ The Bull as published in Rymer contains no article relating to the Count of Flanders; it is entirely confined to the dispute between France and England, and the affairs of Gascony. That article, if there were such, must have been separate and distinct. The English ambassadors, according to another document (New Rymer), refused to enter into the negotiation without the consent of the Counts of Flanders and Bar. The two counts submitted, like the two kings, to the Papal arbitration.

marry her according to his own choice;¹ and also commanded Philip himself to take up the Cross for the Holy Land. The King could not restrain his wrath. Count Robert of Artois seized the insolent parchment: "Such dishonor shall never fall on the kingdom of France." He threw it into the fire.² Some trembled, some highly lauded this contempt of the Pope.

It is quite certain that Philip took a step of more decided disdain and hostility to the Pope, in entering into an open alliance and connection by marriage with the excommunicated Albert of Austria. The King of the Romans and the King of France met in great pomp between Toul and Vaucouleurs, on the confines of their kingdoms. Blanche, the sister of Philip, was solemnly espoused to Rodolph, son of Albert of Austria. This step implied more than mistrust, total disbelief in the promises held out by Pope Boniface to Charles of Valois, that not merely he should be placed, as the reward of his Italian conquests, on the throne of the Eastern Empire, but that the Pope would insure his succession to the Empire of the West, held to be vacant by the

¹ I have quoted above the bull annulling the marriage contract of young Edward of England with this princess, p. 279.

² Dupuy, Mezeray, and Velly relate all this without hesitation. Sismondi rejects it altogether. Dupuy refers to Villani, where there is not a word about it, and to the Flemish historian Ouderghest. "*De Philippe le Bel, en la presence de plusieurs Princes du Royaulme, et entre autres de Robert Comite d'Artois, lesquels aperçoivant d'une inusitée melancholie et tristesse que la dicte sentence avait causé au cœur d'iceluy, print les dictes bulles des mains de l'Archévêque (Rheims) lesquels il déchira et jecta au feu, disant que tel deshonneur n'aviendroit jamais à un Roi de France. Dont aucuns des Assistants le louèrent grandement, les autres le blasmerent.*" — Ouderghest, p. 222. It is singular that there is the same obscurity about the demand made, it is said, by the Bishop of Pamiers for the liberation of the Count of Flanders — one of the causes which exasperated Philip most violently against that prelate.

death of Adolph of Nassau. These magnificent hopes the Pope had not the power, Philip manifestly believed that he had not the will, to accomplish.¹ Albert of Austria was yet under the Papal ban as the murderer of his Sovereign. Boniface had exhorted the ecclesiastical electors to resist his usurpation, as he esteemed it, to the utmost. Neither the Archbishops of Mentz nor of Cologne were present at the meeting. Albert of Austria communicated this treaty of marriage with the royal house of France to the Pope; and no doubt hoped to advance at least the recognition of his title as King of the Romans. Boniface refused to admit the ambassadors of the vassal who had slain his lord, of a Prince who, without the Papal sanction, dared to assume the title of King of the Romans.²

Rumors of more ostentatious contemptuousness were widely disseminated in Transalpine Christendom, and among the Ghibellines of Northern Italy. Boniface had appeared in warlike attire, and declared that himself, the successor of St. Peter, was the only Cæsar. During the Jubilee he had displayed himself alternately in the splendid habiliments of the Pope and those of the Emperor, with the crown on his head, the sceptre in his hand, and the Imperial sandals on his feet; he had two swords borne before him, and thus openly assumed the full temporal as well as spiritual supremacy over mankind. These reports, whether grounded on some misunderstanding of acts or words, or on the general haughty demeanor of the Pope, whether gross exaggeration or absolute invention, were

Rumors
about Boni-
face.

¹ *Historia Australis*, apud Freher, i. 417, sub ann. 1299. Leibnitz, *Cod. Diplom.* i. 25.

² Raynald. sub ann. 1300.

no doubt spread by the industrious vindictiveness of the Pontiff's enemies.¹ It was no augury of peace that some of the Colonnas were openly received at the court of France: Stephen, the nephew of the two The Colonnas. Cardinals (they remained at Genoa), Sciarra, a name afterwards more fatal to the Pope, redeemed by the liberality of the King from the corsairs who had taken him on the high seas. It is far from improbable that from the Colonnas and their partisans, not only such statements as these had their source or their blacker coloring, but even darker and more heinous charges. These were all seized by the lawyers, Peter Flotte and William of Nogaret. Italian revenge, brooding over cruel and unforgiven injuries, degradation, impoverishment, exile; Ghibelline hatred, with the discomfiture of ecclesiastical ambition in the Churchmen, would be little scrupulous as to the weapons which it would employ. Boniface, if not the victim of his overweening arrogance, may have been the victim of his own violence and implacability.

The unfortunate, if not insulting, choice of his Legate at this peculiar crisis precipitated the rupture. Instead of one of the grave, smooth, distinguished, if inflexible, Cardinals of his own court, Boniface intrusted with this difficult mission a man turbulent, intriguing, odious to Philip; with notions of sacerdotal power as stern and unbending as his own; a subject of the King of France, yet in a part of the kingdom in which that subjection was recent and doubtful. Bernard Saisset had been Abbot of St. Anto- Saisset
nine's in Pamiers, a city of Languedoc. The Bishop of
Pamiers.
Counts of Foix had a joint jurisdiction with the Abbot

¹ Of one thing only I am confident, that they are not later inventions.

over that city and over the domains of the convent. But the house of Foix during the Albigensian war had lost all its power; these rights passed first to Simon de Montfort, then to the King of France. But the King of France, Philip the Hardy, had rewarded Roger Bernard, Count of Foix, for his services in the war of Catalonia, with the grant of all his rights over Pamiers, except the absolute suzerainty. The Abbots resisted the grant, and refused all accommodation. The King commanded the Viscount of Bigorre, who held the castle, to put it into the hands of the Count of Foix.

A.D. 1295,
1296.

The Abbot appealed to Rome. Roger Bernard was excommunicated; his lands placed under interdict. The Pope erected the city of Pamiers into a Bishopric; Bernard Saisset became Bishop, and condescended to receive a large sum from the Count of Foix, with a fixed rent on the estates. The Count of Foix did homage at the feet of the Bishop.

Such was the man chosen by Boniface as Legate to the proud and irascible Philip the Fair. There is no record of the special object of his mission or of his instructions. It is said that he held the loftiest and most contemptuous language concerning the illimitable power of the Church over all temporal sovereigns; that his arrogant demeanor rendered his demands still more insulting; that he peremptorily insisted on the liberation of the Count of Flanders and his daughter. Philip, after the proclamation of his truce with England, had again sent a powerful army into Flanders: the Count was abandoned by the King of England, abandoned by his own subjects. Guy of Dampierre (we have before alluded to his fate) had been com-

pelled to surrender with his family, and was now a prisoner in France. Philip had the most deep-rooted hatred of the Count of Flanders, as a rebellious vassal, and as one whom he had cruelly injured. Some passion as profound as this, or his most sensitive pride, must have been galled by the Bishop of Pamiers, or even Philip the Fair would hardly have been goaded to measures of such vindictive violence. Philip was surrounded by his great lawyers, his Chancellor Peter Flotte, his confidential advisers, Enguerrand de Marigny, William de Plasian, and William of Nogaret, honest counsellors as far as the advancement of the royal power, the independence of the temporal on the spiritual sovereignty, and the administration of justice by learned and able men, according to fixed principles of law, instead of the wild and uncertain judgments of the petty feudal lords, lay or ecclesiastic; dangerous counsellors, as servile instruments of royal encroachment, oppression, and exaction; everywhere straining the law, the old Roman law, in favor of the kingly prerogative, beyond its proper despotism. Philip, by their advice, determined to arraign the Papal Legate, as a subject guilty at least of spoken treason. He allowed the Bishop to depart, but Saisset was followed May, 1301.

or preceded by a commission sent to Toulouse, the Archdeacon of Angers and the Vidame of Amiens, to collect secret information as to his conduct and language. So soon as the Legate Bishop arrived in his diocese, he found a formidable array of charges prepared against him. Twenty-four witnesses had been examined; the Counts of Foix and Comminges, the Bishops of Toulouse, Beziers, and Maguelone, the Abbot of St. Pepoul. He was accused of simony, of her-

esy, principally as regarded confession.¹ The Bishop would have fled at once to Rome; but this flight without the leave of the King or his metropolitan had incurred the forfeiture of his temporalities. He sent the Abbot of Mas d'Asil humbly to entreat permission to retire. But the King's commissioners were on the watch. The Vidame of Amiens stood by night at the gates of the Episcopal Palace, summoned the Bishop to appear before the King, searched all his chambers, set the royal seal on all his books, papers, money, plate, on his episcopal ornaments. It is even said that his domestics were put to the torture to obtain evidence against him. After some delay, the Prelate set out July, 1301. from Toulouse, accompanied by the captain of the cross-bowmen and his troop, the Seneschal of Toulouse, and two royal sergeants—ostensibly to do him honor; in fact, as a guard upon the prisoner.

The King was holding his Court-plenary, a Parliament of the whole realm, at Senlis. The Bishop appeared before him, as he sat surrounded by the princes, prelates, knights, and ecclesiastics. Peter Flotte, the Keeper of the Seals, rose and arraigned the Bishop as having uttered many contemptuous and treasonable words against the King's Majesty. He offered to substantiate these grave charges by unexceptionable witnesses. Then Bishop Bernard was accused of having repeated a prediction of Saint Louis, that in the third generation, under a weak prince, the kingdom of France would pass forever from his line into that of strangers; of having said that Philip was in every way unworthy of the crown; that

¹ Dupuy, *Preuves*, p. 626. There may be read the depositions of the witnesses.

he was not of the pure race of Charlemagne, but of a bastard branch ; that he was no true King, but a handsome image, who thought of nothing but being looked upon with admiration by the world ; that he deserved no name but that of issuer of base money ;¹ that his court was treacherous, corrupt, and unbelieving as himself ; that he had grievously oppressed by tyranny and extortion all who spoke the language of Toulouse ; that he had no authority over Pamiers, which was neither within the realm nor held of the kingdom of France. There were other charges of acts, not of words ; secret overtures to England ; attempts to alienate the loyalty of the Counts of Comminges, and to induce the province of Languedoc to revolt, and set up her old independent Counts.² The Chancellor concluded by addressing the metropolitan, the Archbishop of Narbonne, summoning him in the King's name to seize and secure the person thus accused by the King of *leze majesté* ; if the Archbishop refused, the King must take his own course. The Archbishop was in the utmost consternation and difficulty. He dared not absolutely refuse obedience to the King. The life of the Bishop was threatened by some of the more lawless of the court. He was withdrawn, as if for protection ; the King's guards slept in his chamber. The Archbishop remonstrated against this insult towards a spiritual person. The King demanded whether he would be answerable for the safe custody of the prisoner. The Archbishop was bound not only by awe, but by gratitude to the Pope. One of the causes of the quarrel between Boniface and the King was the zealous assertion of the Archbishop's rights to the Countship of

¹ *Faux monnayeur.*

² The charges are in Dupuy, p. 633, *et seq.*

Maguelone. He consulted the Archbishop of Auch and the other bishops. It was agreed that the Bishop of Senlis should make over for a certain time a portion of his territory to the Archbishop. Within that ceded territory the Bishop should be kept, but not in close custody; his own chamberlain alone was to sleep in his chamber, but the King might appoint a faithful knight to keep guard. He was to have his chaplains; permission to write to Rome, his letters being first examined; lest his diocese should suffer damage, his seal was to be locked up in a strong chest under two keys, of which he retained one.

King Philip could not commit this bold act of the seizure and imprisonment of a bishop, a Papal Nuncio, without communicating his proceedings to the Pope. This communication was made, either accompanied or followed by a solemn embassy. But if the Legate appointed by the Pope was the most obnoxious ecclesiastic whom he could have chosen, the chief ambassador designated by the King, who proceeded to Rome, and affronted the Pope by his dauntless language, was the Keeper of the Seals, Peter Flotte.¹ If the King and his counsellors had desired to show the malice and falsehood or gross exaggeration of the treasonable charges brought against the Bishop of Pamiers, they could not have done it more effectually than by the monstrous language which they accused him of having used against the Pope himself, the Pope, whom he represented as Legate or Nuncio at the court of France,

¹ After careful examination of the evidence, I think there is no doubt of this mission of Peter Flotte. It cannot be pure invention. See Matt. Westm. *in loc.* Walsingham. Spondanus, sub ann. 1301. Raynald. *ibid.* Baillet, Demelès, p. 113, &c.

the object of his devout reverence as a High Churchman, to whom he had applied for protection, at whose feet he sought for refuge. The Bishop of Pamiers (so averred the King of France in a public despatch) was not only, according to the usual charges against all delinquent prelates, guilty of heresy, simony, and unbelief; of having declared the sacrament of penance a human invention, fornication not forbidden to the clergy: in accumulation of these offences, he had called Boniface the Supreme Pontiff, in the hearing of many credible witnesses, the devil incarnate; he had asserted "that the Pope had impiously canonized St. Louis, who was in hell." "No wonder that this man had not hesitated to utter the foulest treasons against his temporal sovereign, when he had thus blasphemed against God and the Church." "All this the inquisitors had gathered from the attestations of bishops, abbots, and religious men, as well as counts, knights, and burghers." The King demanded the degradation and the condemnation of the Bishop by spiritual censures, and permission to make "a sacrifice to God by the hands of justice." Peter Flotte is declared, even in the presence of the Pope, to have maintained his unawed intrepidity. To the Pope's absolute assertion of his superiority over the secular power, the Chancellor replied with sarcastic significance, "Your power in temporal affairs is a power in word, that of the King my master in deed."

Such negotiations, with such a negotiator, were not likely to lead to peace. Bull after Bull came forth; several of the earlier ones bore the same date. The first was addressed to the King. It declared in the strongest terms that the temporal sover-

Papal Bulls.
Dec. 3.

eign had no authority whatever over the person of an ecclesiastic. "The Pope had heard with deep sorrow that the King of France had caused the Bishop of Pamiers to be brought before him (Boniface trusted not against his will),¹ and had committed him to the custody of the Archbishop of Narbonne. The Pope exhorted, he commanded the King immediately to release the prelate, to permit him to proceed to Rome, and to restore all his goods and chattels. Unless he did this instantly, he would incur canonical censure for laying his profane and sacrilegious hands on a Dec. 4, 1302. bishop." A second Bull commanded the Archbishop of Narbonne to consider the Bishop as under the special protection of the Pope; to send him, with all the documents produced upon the trial, to Rome; and to inhibit all further proceedings of the King. A third Bull annulled the special suspension, as regarded France, of the famous Papal statute that clerks should make no payments whatever to the laity;² "the King was to learn that by his disobedient conduct he had forfeited all peculiar and distinctive favor from the Holy See." The fourth was even a stronger and more irrevocable act of hostility. This Bull was addressed to all the archbishops and prelates, to the cathedral chapters, and the doctors of the canon and the civil law. It cited them to appear in person, or by A.D. 1302. their representatives, at Rome on the 1st November of the ensuing year, to take counsel concerning all the excesses, crimes, acts of insolence, injury, or exaction, committed by the King of France or his officers against the churches, the secular and

¹ "Utinam non invitum." — Raynald. Ann. 1301. c. xxviii.

² Clericis Laicos.

regular clergy of his kingdom. This was to set himself at the head of a league or conspiracy of the whole clergy of France against their King, it was a levy in mass of the hierarchy in full revolt. The Pope had already condescendingly informed the King of his intention, and entreated him not to be disturbed by these proceedings, but to place full reliance on the equity and indulgence of the Supreme Pontiff.

So closed the first year of this century. Early in the following year was published, or at least widely bruited abroad, a Bull bearing the ^{The lesser Bull.} Pope's signature, brief, sharp, sententious. It had none of that grave solemnity, that unctuous ostentation of pious and paternal tenderness, that prodigality of Scriptural and sacred allusion, which usually sheathed the severest admonitions of the Holy See. "Boniface the Pope to the King of France. We would have you to know that you are subordinate in temporals as in spirituals. The collation to benefices and prebends in no wise belongs to you: if you have any guardianship of vacant benefices, it is only to receive the fruits for the successors. Whatever collations you have made, we declare null; whatever have been carried into effect, we revoke. All who believe not this are guilty of heresy." The Pope, in his subsequent Bulls, openly accuses certain persons of having issued false writings in his name; he intimates, if he does not directly charge Peter Flotte as guilty of the fraud. That this is the document, or one of the documents, thus disclaimed, there can be no doubt. Was it, then, a bold and groundless forgery, or a summary of the Pope's pretensions, stripped of all stately circumlocution, and presented in their odious and offen-

sive plainness, with a view to enable the world, or at least France, to judge on the points at issue? It might seem absolutely incredible that the Chancellor of France should have the audacity to promulgate writings in the name of the Pope altogether fictitious, which the Pope would instantly disown; did not the monstrous charges adduced against the Bishop of Pamiers, and afterwards in open court against the Pope himself, display an utter contempt for truth, a confidence in the credulity of mankind, at least as inconceivable in later times. Our doubts of the sheer invention are rather as to the impolicy than the mendacity of the act. The answer in the name of the King of France — and this answer, undoubtedly authentic, proves irrefragably the publication and wide dissemination of the Lesser Bull of the Pope — with its ostentation not only of discourteous but of vulgar contempt, obtained the same publicity. “Philip, by the grace of God King of France, to Boniface, who assumes to be the Chief Pontiff, little or no greeting.¹ Let your fatuity know, that in temporals we are subordinate to none. The collation to vacant benefices and prebends belongs to us by royal right; the fruits are ours. We will maintain all collations made and to be made by us, and their possessors. All who believe otherwise we hold to be fools and madmen.”²

The more full and acknowledged Bull might indeed

¹ “*Salutem modicam aut nullam.*”

² The weight of evidence that these two extraordinary documents were extant and published at the time seems to me irresistible. They were not contested for 300 years; they are adduced by most of the writers of the time; they are to be found in the Gloss on the Decretals of Boniface, published 40 years after by John Andrew of Bologna. See all the very curious deliberation of Peter de Bosco on this very Bull, published in Dupuy, *Preuves*, p. 45. It is called in general the Lesser Bull.

be almost fairly reduced to the coarse and rude summary of the Lesser.¹ It contained undeniably, under its veil of specious and moderate language, every one of those hardy and unmeasured doctrines. But the language is part of the spirit of such documents; the mitigating and explanatory phrase is not necessarily deceptive or hypocritical: though in truth each party was determined to misunderstand the other. Neither was prepared to follow out his doctrines to their legitimate conclusion; neither could acknowledge the impossibility of fixing the bounds of spiritual and of temporal authority. The Pope's notion of spiritual supremacy necessarily comprehended the whole range of human action: the King represented the Pope as claiming a feudal supremacy, as though he asserted the kingdom of France to be held of him. And this was the intelligible sovereignty which roused the indignation of feudal France, indignation justified by the actual claim of such sovereignty over other kingdoms. Each therefore stood on an impregnable theoretic ground; but each theory, when they attempted to carry it into practice, clashed with insurmountable difficulties.

The greater Bull, of which the authenticity is unquestioned, ran in these terms:—It began Bull, Aus- with the accustomed protestation of parental culta fili.

¹ Sismondi supposes that the Lesser Bull was framed by Peter Flotte, to be laid before the States-General, on account of the great length of the genuine Bull; that having so presented it, and seen its effect, he was unable and unwilling to withdraw it. But of the answers of the three Orders, two are extant, and in a very different tone from the brief one ascribed to the King. It seems to me rather to have been intended as an appeal to popular feeling than to that of a regular assembly. Such substitution is hardly conceivable in an assembly at which all the prelates and great abbots of the kingdom were present. Nor does this notion account for the King's reply.

tenderness, which demanded more than filial obedience, obedience to the Pope as to God. "Hearken, my most dear son, to the precepts of thy father; open the ears of thine heart to the instruction of thy master, the vicegerent of Him who is the one Master and Lord. Receive willingly, be careful to fulfil to the utmost, the admonitions of thy mother, the Church. Return to God with a contrite heart, from whom, by sloth or through evil counsels, thou hast departed, and devoutly conform to His decrees and ours." The Pope then shadows forth the plenary and tremendous power of Rome in the vague and awful words of the Old Testament. "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant."¹ This was no new Papal phrase; it had been used with the same boldness of misappropriation by the Gregories and Innocents of old. It might mean only spiritual censures; it was softened off in the next clause into such meaning.² Yet it might also signify the annulling the subjects' oaths of allegiance, the overthrow by any means of the temporal throne, the transference of the crown from one head to another. This sentence, which in former times had been awful, was now presumptuous, offensive, odious. It was that which the King, at a later period, insisted most strenuously on erasing from the Bull. "Let no one persuade you that you are not subject to the Hierarch of the Celestial Hierarchy." The Bull proceeds to rebuke, in firm, but neither absolutely ungente nor discourteous terms,

¹ Jeremiah, i. 10.

² "Ut gregem pascentes Dominicum . . . alligemus fracta, et reducamus subjecta, vinumque infundamus," &c.

the oppressions of the King over his subjects (the most galling sentences were those which alluded to his tampering with the coin, "his acts as money-changer"), not only the oppressions of Ecclesiastics, but of Peers, Counts, Barons, the Universities, and the people, all of whom the Pope thus takes under his protection. The King's right to the collation of benefices he denies in the most peremptory terms; he brands his presumption in bringing ecclesiastics under the temporal jurisdiction, his levying taxes on the clergy who did not hold fiefs of the Crown, "although no layman has any power whatever over an ecclesiastic:" he censures especially the King's usurpations on the church of Lyons, a church beyond the limits of his realm, and independent of his authority; his abuse of the custody of vacant bishoprics. "The voice of the Pope was hoarse in remonstrating against these acts of iniquity, to which the King turned the ear of the deaf adder." Though the Pope would be justified in taking arms against the King, his bow and quiver (what bow and quiver he leaves in significant obscurity), he had determined to make this last appeal to Philip's conscience. He had summoned the clergy of France to Rome to take cognizance of all these things. He solemnly warned the King against the evil counsellors by whom he was environed; and concluded with the old and somewhat obsolete termination of all such addresses to Christian Kings, an admonition to consider the state of the Holy Land, the all-absorbing duty of recovering the sepulchre of Christ.

The King in all this grave, as it bore upon its face, paternal expostulation, saw only, or chose to see, or was permitted by his loyal counsellors, who by their

servile adulteration of his passions absolutely ruled his mind, to see only the few plain and arrogant demands concentrated in the Lesser Bull, with the allusions to his oppressions and exactions, not less insulting from their truth. His conscience as a Christian was untouched by religious awe; his pride as a King provoked to fury. The Archdeacon of Narbonne, the bearer of the Papal Bull, was ignominiously refused admittance to the royal presence. In the midst of his court, more than ordinarily thronged with nobles, Philip solemnly declared that he would disinherit all his sons if they consented to hold the kingdom of France of any one

Jan. 26,
1302.

but of God. Fifteen days after, the Bull of the Pope was publicly burned in Paris in the King's presence, and this act proclaimed throughout the city by the sound of the trumpet.¹ Paris knew no more of the ground of the quarrel, or of the Papal pretensions, than may have been communicated in the Lesser Bull; it heard in respectful silence, if not with acclamation, the King's defiance of the Pope, at which a century before it would have trembled and wailed, as inevitably to be followed by all the gloom, terror, spiritual privations of an Interdict.

All France seemed prepared to espouse the quarrel of the King. Philip, or Philip's counsellors, had such confidence in the state of the public mind, which themselves had so skilfully wrought up, as boldly to appeal to the whole nation. The States-General
States-General
April 10, 1302. were summoned for the first time, not only the two orders, the Nobles and the Clergy, but the commonalty also, the burghers of the towns and cities, now rising into notice and wealth. The States-Gen-

¹ Dupuy, p. 59.

eral met in the church of Notre Dame at Paris. The Chancellor, Peter Flotte, submitted, and put his own construction on the several Bulls issued by the Pope on the 5th of December, which withdrew the privileges conceded by himself to the realm of France, summoned all the Bishops and Doctors of Theology and Law in France to Rome, as his subjects and spiritual vassals, and (this was the vital question) asserted that the King held the realm of France, not of God, but of the Pope. This feudal suzerainty, the only suzerainty the Nobles comprehended, and which was declared by the Chancellor to be claimed by the Pope, was hardly less odious to them than to the King. The clergy were embarrassed; some, no doubt, felt strongly the national pride of independence, though they owed unlimited allegiance to the Pope. They held, too, fiefs of the Crown; and the collation of benefices by the Crown secured them from that of which they were especially jealous, the intrusion of foreigners into the preferments which they esteemed their own right. There had been from the days of Hincmar of Rheims at least, a vague notion of some special and distinctive liberties belonging to the Gallican Church. The Commons, or the Third Estate, would hardly have been summoned by Philip and his subtle advisers, if their support to the royal cause had not been sure. The pride of their new political importance, their recognition as part of the nation, if not their intelligence, would maintain their loyalty to the crown, undisturbed by any superstitious veneration for the Hierarchy.

Each order drew up its separate address to the Papal Court; that of the ruder Nobles was in French, not to the Pope, but to the Cardi-
Address of
the Nobles to
the Cardinals;

nals; that of the clergy in Latin, to the Pope. These two are extant; the third, of the Commons, which would no doubt have been the most curious, is lost. The Nobles dwell on the long and immemorial and harmonious amity between the Church of Rome and the realm of France; that amity was disturbed by the extortionate and unbridled acts of him who now governed the Church. They, the Nobles and People of France, would never, under the worst extremities, endure the wicked and outrageous innovations of the Pope, his claim of the temporal subjection of the King and the kingdom to Rome, his summoning the prelates and ecclesiastical dignitaries of the realm for the redress of alleged grievances and oppressions before Boniface at Rome. "We, the people of France, neither desire nor will receive the redress of such grievances by his authority or his power, but only from that of our Lord the King." They vindicate the King's determination not to allow the wealth of the realm, especially arms, to be exported from France. They accuse the Pope of having usurped the collation of benefices, and of having bestowed them for money on unknown strangers. By this and his other exactions, the Church was so impoverished and discredited that the bishops could not find men of noble descent, of good birth, or of letters, to accept benefices. "These things, hateful to God and displeasing to good men, had never been seen, and were not expected to be seen, before the time of Antichrist." They call on the Cardinals to arrest the Pope in his dangerous courses, to chastise him for his excesses, "that Christendom may return to peace, and good Christians be able to devote themselves to the recovery of the Holy Land." This letter was signed

by Louis, Count of Evreux, the King's brother; by Robert, Count of Artois; by the Dukes of Burgundy, Bretagne, Lorraine; the Counts of Dreux, St. Pol, de la Marche, Boulogne, Comminges, Albemarle, Forez, Eu, Nevers, Auxerre, Perigord, Joigny, Valentinois, Poitiers, Montbeliard, Sancerre, even by the Flemish Counts of Hainault and Luxemburg, the Lords of Couci and Beaujeu, the Viscount of Narbonne, and some others.¹

The address of the Prelates to the Pope was more respectful, if not, as usual, supplicatory. They too treat as dangerous novelties, now first expressed in the Papal Bulls, the assertion that the King holds his realm of the Pope, the right of the Pope to summon the subjects of the King, high ecclesiastics, to Rome, for the general redress of grievances, wrongs, and injuries committed by the King, his bailiffs or officers. They too urge the collation to benefices of persons unknown, strangers, and not above suspicion, who never reside on their benefices; the unpopularity and impoverishment of the Church; the constant drain on the wealth of the realm by direct exactions and perpetual appeals to Rome. The King had called on them and on the Barons of France to consult with him on the maintenance of the ancient liberties, honor, and state of the kingdom. The Barons had withdrawn, and determined to support the King. They too had retired, but had demanded longer delay, lest they should infringe on their obedience to the Pope. They had at length replied that they held themselves bound to the preservation of the person and of the authority of the King, the rights and liberties of the kingdom. But,

¹ Preuves, p. 61, 62.

as they were also under allegiance to the Pope, they had humbly craved permission to go to Rome to represent the whole case. To this the King and the Barons had answered by a stern refusal to permit them to quit the realm, on the penalty of the seizure and sequestration of all their lands and goods. "So great and imminent was the peril as to threaten an absolute dissolution of the Church and State; the clergy were so odious to the people that they avoided all intercourse with them; tongue could not tell the dangers to which they were exposed."¹

The Cardinals replied to the Dukes, Counts, and Barons of France with dignity and moderation. Answer of the Cardinals. They assured the Nobles of their earnest desire, and that of the Pope, to maintain the friendly relations between the Church of Rome and the kingdom of France. He was an enemy to man (designating clearly, but not naming the Chancellor) who had sowed the tares of discord. The Pope had never written to the King claiming the *temporal* sovereignty. The Archdeacon of Narbonne, as himself deposes, had not advanced such claim. The whole argument, therefore, of the Chancellor was built on sand. They insisted on the right of the Pope to hold Councils, and to summon to such Councils all the prelates of Christendom. In their turn they eluded the charge that this Council was to take cognizance of what were undeniably the temporal affairs of France. "If all the letters of the Pope had been laid before the Prelates and Barons, and their tenor explained by the Pope's Nuncio, they

¹ "Cum jam abhorreant laici et prorsus effugiant consortia clericorum, eos a suis omnino consiliis et allocutionibus abdicando . . . in grave periculum animarum et varia et diversa pericula." — Preuves, p. 70 *et seq.*

would have been found full of love and pious solicitude." They then dwell on the manifest favors of the Papal See to France. They deny that the Pope had appointed any foreign bishops, but to the sees of Bourges and of Arras. In all other cases he had nominated subjects of the realm, men known in the Court, familiar with the King, and of good repute.¹ The answer of the Cardinals to the Mayors, Sheriffs, Jurors of the cities and towns, was in the same grave tone, denying the claim of temporal sovereignty, and alleging the same acts.

The Pope, in his answer to the Prelates and Clergy, did not maintain the same decorous majesty. His wrath was excited by what he deemed Answer of the Pope to the Bishops. the timorous apostasy of Churchmen from the cause of the Church. "Under the hypocritical veil of consolation, the beloved daughter, the Church of France, had heaped reproach on her spotless mother, the Church of Rome. The Prelates had stooped to be mendicants for the suffrages of the Parliament of Paris, and alleged the loss of their property, and the danger of their persons, if they should set out for Rome. That son of Belial, Peter Flotte, whose bodily sight was so feeble, who was stone-blind in soul, had been permitted, and others who thirsted for Christian blood had been permitted, to lead astray our dear son, Philip of France." "And to this ye listened, who ought to have poured scathing contempt upon them all. Ye did this from base timidity, from baser worldliness. But they labor in vain. He that sitteth in the north shall not long lift himself up against the Vicar of Christ Jesus, to whom there has not yet been a second: he shall fall

¹ June 26. Preuves, p. 63.

with all his followers. Do not they who deny the subjection of the temporal to the spiritual power assert the two principles?"¹ This was a subtle blow. Manichæism was the most hated heresy to all who knew, and all who did not know, its meaning.

At Rome, about the same time, was held a Consistory, in which the differences with France were submitted to solemn deliberation. Matthew Acqua Sparta, the Franciscan, Cardinal of Porto, as representing the sense of the Cardinals, delivered a long address, half sermon and half speech. He took for his text, from the epistle of the day before, the Feast of St. John the Baptist, the passage of Jeremiah concerning the universal power to pluck up, root out, destroy, and plant. He applied it directly to John the Baptist, by clear inference to the Pope. He lamented the difference with the King of France, which had arisen from so light a cause; asserted perfect harmony to exist between the Pope and the Sacred College. He declared the real letter sent by the Pope to have been full of gentleness and love; the false letter had neither been sent nor authorized by the Pope. "Had not the King of France a confessor? Did he not receive absolution? It is as partaking of sin that the Pope takes cognizance of all temporal acts." He appeals to the famous similitude of the two luminaries, of which the temporal power was the lesser; but he draws a distinction between the temporal power of the Pope and his right to carry it into execution. "The Vicar of Christ has unbounded jurisdiction, for he is even to judge the quick and the dead; but he is not competent to the use, he is not the execu-

June 25.
Consistory
at Rome.

Speech of
Cardinal of
Porto.

¹ Preuves, p. 66.

tive of the temporal power, for ‘the Lord said, put up thy sword (the temporal sword) into its scabbard.’ ”

The Pope followed the Cardinal of Porto in a more strange line of argument. His text was, Speech of the Pope. “Whom God has joined together, let no man put asunder.” This sentence, applied, he says, by God to our first parents, applies also to the Church and the Kings of France. On the first baptism of the King of France by St. Remigius, the Archbishop said, “Hold thee to the Church: so long as thou holdest to the Church, thou and thy kingdom shall prosper: so soon as thou departest from it, thou and thy kingdom shall perish. What gifts and blessings¹ does not the King of France receive from the Church! even at the present day, by our grants and dispensations, forty thousand livres. ‘Let no man put asunder.’ Who is the man? The word *man* is sometimes used for God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, sometimes for the devil. Here it means that diabolical man, that Antichrist, blind in bodily eyesight, more blind of soul, Peter Flotte. The satellites of that Ahitophel are Robert Count of Artois and the Count St. Pol. It is he that falsified our letter; it is he that made us say to the King that he held his realm of us. For forty years we have been trained in the science of law; we know that there are two powers; how could such a folly enter our head? We say, as our brother the Cardinal of Porto has said, that in nothing would we usurp the royal power; but the King cannot deny that he is subject to us in regard to his sins.” The Pope then enters on the collation to benefices, on which point he is prepared, of his free grace, to make large but special concessions to the

¹ Fomenta.

King. After some expressions of regard, he reassumes the language of reproach and of menace. "But for us, the King would not have a foot in the stirrup. When the English, the Germans, all his more powerful vassals and neighbors, rose up against him in one league, to whom but to us did he owe his triumph? Our predecessors have deposed three kings of France. These things are written in their annals as in ours; and this King, guilty of so much more heinous offences, we could depose as we could discharge a groom,¹ though we should do it with sorrow. As for the citation of Bishops, we could call the whole world to our presence, weak and aged as we are. If they come not at our command, let them know that they are hereby deprived and deposed."

From this Consistory emanated a second Bull, which
The Bull
 "Unam
 sanctam." deliberately and fully defined the powers assumed by the Pope. It asserted the eternal unity of the Catholic Church under St. Peter and his successors. Whosoever, as the Greeks, denied that subordination, denied that themselves were of Christ. "There are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal: our Lord said not of these two swords, 'it is too much,' but 'it is enough.' Both are in the power of the Church: the one the spiritual, to be used *by* the Church, the other the material, *for* the Church; the former that of priests, the latter that of kings and soldiers, to be wielded at the command and by the sufferance of the priest.² One sword must be under the other, the temporal under the spiritual. . . . The

¹ "Nos deponeremus Regem, sicut unum garcionem." See the whole speech in Raynald. sub ann.

² Ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis.

spiritual instituted the temporal power, and judges whether that power is well exercised." The eternal verse of Jeremiah is adduced. "If the temporal power errs, it is judged by the spiritual. To deny this, is to assert, with the heretical Manicheans, two coequal principles. We therefore assert, define, and pronounce that it is necessary to salvation to believe that every human being is subject to the Pontiff of Rome." ¹

The insurrection in Flanders diverted the minds of men for some short time from this quarrel July 11, 1302. which appalled Christendom. The free and industrious Flemish manufacturing burghers found the rule of the King of France more intolerable than that of their former lords. Their victory at Courtrai, foretold by a comet, the most bloody and humiliating defeat which for years had been suffered by the arms of France, was not likely to soothe the haughty temper of Philip. The loftier Churchmen, in the death of Robert of Artois on that fatal field, saw the judgment of God on him, who was said to have trodden under foot the Pope's Bull of arbitration, whose seal was the first affixed to the remonstrance of the Nobles in the Parliament of Paris.² Among those that fell was a more dire enemy of the Pope, the Chancellor Peter Flotte.

Hence, perhaps, in the mean time attempts had been made to obtain the mediation of some of the greater vassals of the Crown, the Dukes of Bretagne and of Burgundy. The Pope had intimated that they would

¹ Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, et diffinimus omnino esse de necessitate fidei." — *Preuves*, p. 54.

² *Continuat. Nangis, Bouquet*, p. 585. *Chroniques de St. Denys*, p. 670. Villani (viii. 55) antedates the battle March 21. He is especially indignant that the nobles of France were defeated by base artisans, "tesserandoli e fulloni." This is curious in the mercantile Florentine.

be more fitting and acceptable ambassadors than the King's insolent legal counsellors. Those powerful and almost independent sovereigns had commissioned Hugh, a brother of the Order of Knights Templars, to express their earnest desire for the reconciliation of the King Sept. 5. with the Pope. From Anagni the Cardinal of Porto wrote to the Duke of Bretagne, the Cardinals of San Pudenziana and St. Maria Nuova to the Duke of Burgundy, representing the insult offered to the Pope in publicly burning his Bull (an act which neither heretic, pagan, nor tyrant would have done), and the friendly and patient tone of the Pope's genuine letters. They explained the reason why the Pope could not write to one actually in a state of excommunication. They exhorted the princes to induce the King to humble himself before his spiritual father.

The Prelates of France had been summoned to appear in Rome at the beginning of November. Prelates who go to Rome. It was to be seen how many would dare to defy the resentment of the King, and resolutely obey their spiritual sovereign. There were only four Archbishops, thirty-five Bishops, six of the great Abbots. Of these by far the larger number were the Bishops of Bretagne, Burgundy, and Languedoc. The Archbishop of Tours headed eight of his Breton suffragans; the Archbishop of Auch fifteen Provençals, including the Bishop of Pamiers. The Archbishop of Bordeaux was a subject of the King of England, as Duke of Aquitaine. The Archbishop of Bourges was one of the Italians promoted by the Pope; with him went one or two of his suffragans. Philip, it might seem, knew from what quarters he might expect this defection. The Seneschal of Toulouse received orders to publish

the royal prohibition to all Barons, Knights, Primates, Bishops, or Abbots against quitting the realm ; or, if they should have quitted it, to command their instant return, on pain of corporal punishment and confiscation of all their temporal goods. These southern provinces he watched with peculiar jealousy, and, as if determined to shake the ecclesiastical dominion, he published an edict,¹ denouncing the cruelties and tyranny of the Inquisition, and of Fulk of St. George, the head of that awful tribunal. This arraignment, while it appeared to strike at the abuses, condemned the Office itself. “Complaints have reached us from all quarters, from Prelates and Barons, that Brother Fulk, the Inquisitor of heretical offences, has encouraged those errors and crimes which it is his function to extirpate. Under the pretext of law he has violated all law ; under the semblance of piety, committed acts of the grossest impiety and inhumanity ; under the plea of defending the Catholic faith, done deeds at which the minds of men revolt with horror. There is no bound to his exactions, oppressions, and charges against our faithful subjects. In defiance of the canonical rules, he begins his processes by arrest and torture, by torture new and unheard of. Those whom, according to his caprice, he accuses of having denied Christ or attacked the foundations of the faith, he compels by these tortures to make false admissions of guilt ; if he cannot compel their inflexible innocence to confess guilt, he suborns false witnesses against them.”² This was the Ordinance of the King who cruelly seized and tortured the Templars !

¹ Ordonnances des Rois.

² Ordonnances des Rois, i. 340. Hist. de Languedoc. Preuves, No. 54, p. 118.

Philip con-
demns the
Inquisition.
Oct. 21.

The winter passed in vain overtures for reconciliation. Each sought to strengthen himself by new alliances; Philip by concessions to his people, extorted partly by the unprosperous state of affairs in Flanders, and from the desire to make his personal quarrel with the Pope a national affair.¹ As the year advanced, Philip pressed the conclusion of the peace with England; it was ratified at Paris. Philip resigned Aquitaine on the due performance of homage by England. The Pope suddenly forgot all the crimes and contumacy of Albert of Austria. The murderer of his predecessor, against whom Boniface himself had excited the ecclesiastical electors to rebellion, became a devout and prudent son, who had humbly submitted, not to the judgment, but to the clemency of his father, and had offered to prove himself innocent of the misdeed imputed to him, and to undergo such penance as should be imposed upon him by the Holy See. The Pope wrote to the Princes of the Empire, commanding them to render their allegiance to Albert; and it suited the present policy of Albert to obtain the Empire on any terms. July 17, 1303. At Nuremberg he promulgated a golden Bull, sealed with the Imperial seal, in which he acknowledged, in terms as full as ever had been extorted from the most humiliated of his predecessors, that the Roman Empire had been granted to Charlemagne by the Apostolic See; that though the King of the Romans was chosen by certain temporal and ecclesiastical Electors, the temporal sword derived all its authority from the oath of allegiance to the Pope. The protection of the Church was the first and paramount duty of the Emperor. He swore to guard the Pope against

¹ Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, ix. p. 104.

any injury to life or limb ; and though it was a customary phrase, yet it is curious that he swore also, as if the scene at Anagni might be foreseen distinctly, to guard from capture and imprisonment.¹ He swore too that the Pope's enemies should be his enemies, of whatever rank or dignity, Kings or Emperors. The eagerness with which Albert of Austria detached himself from the alliance of the King of France, though cemented by marriage, the profound humility of his language, was not calculated to diminish the haughty confidence of Boniface in the awe still inspired by the Papal power.² Boniface had the prudence to secure himself against the French interest in Italy : he consented at length to permit the King of Naples to rest content with the throne of that kingdom, and to acknowledge Frederick of Arragon as King of Trinacria. Charles of Valois had returned to France to assist his brother in the wars of Flanders.

Philip, on his side, was preparing certain popular acts, which were to be proclaimed at the same great assembly in the Louvre before which he had determined to appeal to his subjects against the encroachments of the Pope. Yet for a time he had been even more deeply wounded by his unavenged discomfiture by the Flemings, and he had not therefore altogether abandoned the thought of pacification with the Pope. It can hardly have been unauthorized by the King, that the Count of Alençon and the Bishop of Auxerre, one of the Prelates who had obeyed the citation to Rome,

¹ "Capi malâ captivitate." Compare Raynald. sub ann. 1303.

² Velly, Coxe, and others write confidently of the offer of the French crown to Albert; with Sismondi, I can discover no trace of this in the contemporary documents.

had held out hopes that the King was not averse to an amicable settlement. Accordingly John Le Moine, The Papal Legate at Paris. Cardinal of St. Marcellinus and St. Peter, a native of Picardy, appeared in the Court at Paris. But the mission of the Legate was not one of peace. Boniface must have miscalculated most grievously both the blow inflicted by the Flemings on the power of Philip, and the strength derived by himself from his Ghibelline alliance with the Emperor. The Legate was instructed first to summon those Prelates, the King's partisans, who had not made their appearance at Rome, to obey the Pope without delay, and hasten to the feet of his Holiness, under the penalty of immediate deposition. These Prelates were the Archbishops of Sens and Narbonne, the Bishops of Soissons, Beauvais, and Meaux, with the Abbot of St. Denis. The Archbishop of Rouen, the Bishops of Paris, Amiens, Langres, Poitiers, and Bayeux had alleged their age and infirmity. The Pope condescended to admit their excuse. So too were excused the Italian Bishop of Arras, who was of such tried loyalty to the Pope (was he employed in keeping up the correspondence of which Boniface was accused with the revolted Flemings?), and the Bishop and Chapter of Laon, on account of some heavy charges which they had borne.

The Legate had twelve Articles which he was to Twelve Articles. offer to the King for his immediate and peremptory assent; articles of absolute and humiliating concession on his part, on that of the Pope of unyielding rigor, if not of insulting menace or more insulting clemency. I. The revocation of the King's inhibitory Edict against the ecclesiastics who had gone to Rome in obedience to the Papal citation, full satis-

faction to all who had undergone penalties, the abrogation of all processes instituted against them in the King's Courts. II. The Pope asserted his inherent right to collate to all benefices; no layman could collate without authority from the Apostolic See. III. The Pope had full right to send Legates to any part of Christendom. IV. The administration and distribution of all ecclesiastical property and revenue is in the Pope alone, not in any other person, ecclesiastic or lay. The Pope has power, without asking the assent of any one, to lay on them any charge he may please. V. No King or Prince can seize the goods of any ecclesiastic, nor compel any ecclesiastic to appear in the King's Courts to answer to any personal actions or for any property not held as a fief of the Crown. VI. The King was to give satisfaction for his contumelious act in burning the Papal Bull to which were appended the images of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul. VII. The King is not to abuse what is called the Regale, the custody and guardianship of vacant benefices. VIII. The spiritual sword (judicature) is to be restored to the Prelates and other ecclesiastics. IX. The King is no longer to blind himself to the iniquity of the debasement of the coin, and the damage thus wrought on the Prelates, Barons, and Clergy of the realm. X. The King is to call to mind the misdeeds and excesses charged upon him in our private letters by our notary.¹ XI. The city of Lyons is entirely independent of the King of France. XII. The Pope, unless the King amended and corrected all these misdoings, would at once proceed against him spiritually and temporally.

¹ *Litera Clausa*. James the notary was, I presume, the Archdeacon of Narbonne.

The King answered each separate Article ; and his answers seem to imply some apprehension that his power was shaken, some disinclination to proceed to extremities. He stooped to evasion, perhaps more than evasion. I. The King denied that the inhibition to his subjects to quit the realm was aimed at the Prelates summoned to Rome. It was a general precautionary inhibition to prevent the exportation of the riches and produce of the realm during the war and the revolt of his Flemish vassals. II. The King demanded no more, with regard to the collation of benefices, than had been enjoyed by St. Louis and his other royal predecessors. III. The King had no wish to prohibit the reception of the Papal Legates, unless suspected persons and on just grounds. IV. The King had no design to interfere with the administration of the property of the Church, except so far as was warranted by his rights and by ancient custom. V. and VIII. So as to the seizure of the goods of the Church. The King intends nothing beyond law and usage. He is fully prepared to give the Church the free use of the spiritual sword in all cases where the Church has competent jurisdiction. To the VIth Article, the burning of the Bull, the answer is most extraordinary. The King affects to suppose that the Pope alludes not to the Bull publicly burned at Paris with sound of trumpet, but to that of a Bull relating to the Chapter of Laon, burned on account of its invalidity. VII. The King denies the abuse of the Regale. IX. The debasement of the coin took place on account of the exigencies of the State. It was a prerogative exercised by all Kings of France, and the King was engaged in devising a remedy for the evil.

XI. The King had interfered in the affairs of Lyons, on account of a dangerous feud between the Archbishop and the people. The Archbishop, he averred, owed to him an oath of fealty, which had been refused, nevertheless he was prepared to continue his good offices. XII. The King earnestly desired that the unity and peace which had so long subsisted between the kingdom of France and the Roman See should be restored: he was prepared to act by the counsel of the Dukes of Bretagne and Burgundy. To these the Pope himself had proposed to submit all their differences.

With these answers of the King the Pope declared himself utterly dissatisfied. Some were in April 13. absolute defiance of truth, none consonant with justice. He would endure martyrdom rather than submit to such degrading conditions. But the same messengers which bore the Pope's instructions to the Cardinal of St. Marcellinus to appeal again to the King's Council were the bearers of another Brief. That Brief declared that Philip, King of France, notwithstanding his royal dignity, and notwithstanding ^{The King} any privilege or indulgence, had actually in-^{excommu-}^{nicated.} curred the penalties of the general Excommunication published by the Pope; that he was excommunicate for having prohibited the Bishops of France from attending, according to the Pope's command, at Rome. All ecclesiastics, of whatever rank, even Bishops or Archbishops, who should presume to celebrate mass before the King, preach, administer any of the sacraments, or hear confession, were likewise excommunicate. This sentence was to be proclaimed in all convenient places within the realm. The King's con-

fessor, Nicolas, a Friar Preacher, had orders to fix a peremptory term of three months for the King's submission, for his personal appearance at Rome, to be dealt with according to his deserts, and, if he were able, to prove his innocence.

But already, above a month before the date of these Briefs, the King had held his Parliament at the Louvre in Paris. The Prelates and Barons had been summoned to take counsel on affairs touching the welfare of the realm. Only two Archbishops, Sens and Narbonne, three Bishops, Meaux, Nevers, and Angers,¹ obeyed the royal summons; but the Barons made up an imposing assemblage. Before this audience appeared William of Nogaret, one of the great lawyers, most eminent in the King's favor. Nogaret was born in the diocese of Toulouse, of a race whose blood had been shed by the Inquisition.² The Nemesis of that awful persecution was about to wreak itself on the Papacy. Nogaret had become a most distinguished Professor of Civil Law and Judge of Beauchaire: he had been ennobled by Philip the Fair. It is dangerous to crush hereditary religion out of men's hearts. Law and the most profound devotion to the King had become the religion of Nogaret. He was a man without fear, without scruple; perhaps thought that he was only inflicting just retribution on the persecutors of his ancestors. According to the accustomed form, William of Nogaret began his address to the Assembly with a text of Scripture. "There were

¹ So writes Sismondi. It is Antessiodor in the document; but the Bishop of Auxerre was possibly still in Rome.

² Philip's edict against the Inquisition was probably suggested by Nogaret.

false prophets among the people, so among you are masters of lies.”¹ These are the words of Saint Peter, and in the chair of Saint Peter sits the master of lies, ill-named the doer of good (Boniface), but rather the doer of evil.² Boniface (he went on) had usurped the Holy See; he had wedded the Roman Church, while her lawful husband, Coelestine, was alive; him he had compelled to an unlawful abdication by fraud and violence. Nogaret laid down, in strict legal phrase, four propositions:—I. That the Pope was not the true Pope. II. That he was a heretic: III. Was a notorious Simoniac: IV. A man weighed down with crimes—pride, iniquity, treachery, rapacity—an insupportable load and burden to the Church. He appealed to a General Council: he declared it to be the office and function of the King of France to summon such Council. “Before that Council he was prepared to appear and to substantiate all these charges.” The public notaries made record of these accusations, advanced in the presence of the two Archbishops and the three Bishops, of many princes and nobles, whose names were recited in the decree of record.

Philip, to attach all orders of his subjects to the throne during this imminent crisis, and perhaps to divert the minds of men from the dar-
Ordinance of Reformation.
 ing blow, the arraignment of a Pope before a General Council, had prepared his great Ordinance for the reformation of the realm. The Ordinance was manifestly designed for the especial conciliation of the clergy. All churches and monasteries, all prelates and ecclesiastics, were to be held in the grace and favor of the King, as of his religious ancestors: their immunities

¹ St. Peter, Epist. ii. 21.

² Maleficus.

and privileges were to be respected, as in the time of St. Louis: all good and ancient customs were to be maintained; all new and bad ones annulled. The right of the King to seize or confiscate the goods of the clergy was indeed asserted, but in guarded and temperate terms. The Regale was not to be abused, and (a curious illustration of the mode of life) the fish-ponds of the ecclesiastics were not to be drained during the time of vacancy. Ecclesiastics coming to the King's Court were to be immediately heard, that they might return to their sacred charge. No fees were to be received by the King's officers from ecclesiastics.¹

The Ordinance for the reformation of the realm was skilfully designed to cover the extension of the royal power by the extension of the royal jurisdiction: yet it professed to respect all separate jurisdictions of Prelates and Barons; it was content to supersede them without violence. Two Parliaments were to be held yearly at Paris, two Exchequer Courts at Rouen, two Days at Troyes, one Parliament at Toulouse. No doubt Philip's jurists intended thus, without alarming the feudal Lords, quietly to draw within their own sphere almost the whole business of the realm. Their more profound science, the more authoritative power of executing their sentences, the greater regularity of their proceedings, would give to the King's Courts and to those of the Parliaments every advantage over that of the Bishop or of the Baron. As though the King were disposed to win the affections of every class of his people, there are in the Ordinance special instructions to the royal officers to execute their functions

¹ Ordonnances des Rois de France, vol. i. sub anno.

with moderation and gentleness.¹ The Crown was absolutely compelled to the harsh and unwelcome duty of levying taxes by the disloyalty and rebellion of some of its subjects. Not only were the King's bailiffs and seneschals to be thus courteous and forbearing, even the sergeants were to be mild and soft-spoken.²

The Pope had either not heard, or disdained to regard, what he might yet esteem the impotent audacity of William of Nogaret, and the audience given to his unprecedented requisition by the Parliameht held in the Louvre. In his letter, dated one month after, to the Cardinal St. Marcellinus, in which he rejected the replies of Philip to his demands, there is no allusion to this glaring insult. But the King of France had early intimation of the contents of the Papal letters, which commanded the Cardinal of St. Marcellinus to declare him actually excommunicate.³ The bearers of these letters were the Archdeacon of Coutances and Nicolas Benefracto, a servant of the Cardinal. It is said that, in the pride of being employed on such important services, they betrayed the secret of their despatches. "They bore that which would make the King tremble

¹ "C'est assavoir que vous devez être avisez de parler au peuple par douces paroles, et démonstrer les grans désobéissances, rebellions, et dommages." — Ibid.

² "Et vous avisez de mettre Sergens débonnaires et tractables pour faire vos exécutions, si que il n'aient cause de eux doloir." — Ordonnance.

³ The succession of events, on which much depends, is by no means clear. Velly places the mission of Cardinal Le Moine, the articles offered by him, the elaborate answer of the King, after the Parliament in the Louvre, in which William of Nogaret appeared (March 12). The Pope's letter to the Cardinal expressing his dissatisfaction at Philip's answers, as contained in the Cardinal's to Rome which he had then received, is dated April 13. The mission, the reception by Philip, the offer of the articles, the time for the deliberate reply, the communication of the result to Rome, the Pope's letter, could not possibly have been concluded in a month.

on his throne." Orders were given to the King's officers to arrest them: they were seized and thrown into prison at Troyes. Certain other priests boasted that they had been permitted to take copies of these Briefs, and were promulgating them in order to stir up the people to insurrection. The Cardinal protested, and imperiously demanded the delivery of the Briefs into his hands. The Edict confiscating the goods of the Bishops who had attended the Synod at Rome was renewed, if not put in execution. The Order which convoked again the States-General, to take counsel on the crimes and disabilities of his master the Pope, was fixed on the walls of the Monastery of St. Martin at Tours, where the Legate was lodged. All his movements were watched; he could neither receive a visit nor a single paper without the King's knowledge. He determined to return to Rome, mortified and humbled by the total failure of his mission, which he had been instructed to carry out with such imposing haughtiness. No doubt he had acted up to those instructions.

The States-General held their second meeting in the Louvre on the 13th of June. Louis Count of Evreux, Guy Count of St. Pol, John Count of Dreux, William of Plasian, Knight and Lord of Vezenoble (Peter Flotte, the Chancellor, had fallen at Courtrai, William of Nogaret was elsewhere), presented themselves before the Assembly, and declared that Christendom was in the utmost danger and misery through the misrule of Boniface; that a lawful Pope was necessary for her salvation; that Boniface was laden with crimes. William of Plasian swore upon the Gospels that these charges were true; that he was prepared to prove them before a General

Second Par-
liament in
the Louvre.
June 13.

Council ; that the King, as champion of the faith, was compelled to summon such Council. It was no less the duty of the Prelates and Nobles to concur in this measure. The Prelates observed that it was an affair of the gravest import, and required mature deliberation. The next day William of Plasian produced his charges, charges of the most monstrous heresy, infidelity, and, what was perhaps worse, wizardry and dealing with evil spirits ; charges against a Pope who for nearly nine years had exercised the full authority of St. Peter's successor ; a man now in extreme old age, whose life and stern inflexible orthodoxy had been till now above question ; who had been the chosen arbiter of Kings in their quarrels ; who had been almost adored at the Jubilee by assenting Christendom ; who was even at this time bestowing the Imperial crown, accepted by Albert of Austria with the humblest gratitude. These charges were advanced with a solemn appeal to the Holy Gospels, before the King and the nobility of France, before a great body of ecclesiastics, who, so far from repudiating them at once with indignant impatience, admitted them as the groundwork of a process to be submitted to a General Council of all Christendom : this Council there seems no reasonable doubt was in the actual contemplation, and was deliberately determined on by Philip and his advisers. The articles of accusation cannot be judged The charges. without the examination of their startling, repulsive, even loathsome detail : they must be seen too in their strange confusion. The Pope neither believed the immortality nor the incorruptibility of the human soul, it perished with the body. He did not believe in eternal life ; he had averred that it was no sin to indulge the

body in all pleasures; he had publicly declared and preached that he had rather be a dog, an ass, or any brute beast, than a Frenchman; that no Frenchman had a soul which could deserve everlasting happiness: this he had taught to persons on their death-beds. He did not believe in the Real Presence in the Eucharist. He was reputed (all these things were advanced as matters of public fame and scandal) to have averred that fornication and other obscene practices were no sin. He had often said that to depress the King of France and the French he would devote himself, the world, and the Church to ruin. "Perish the French, come what may." He had approved a book written by a physician, Arnold of Villeneuve, which had been condemned by the Bishop and the Masters of Theology in Paris as heretical. He had caused, to perpetuate his damnable memory, silver images of himself to be set up in the churches, to which the people were tempted to pay idolatrous worship. "He has a special familiar devil, whose counsels he follows in all things."¹ He is a sortilege, and consults diviners and fortune-tellers. He has declared that Popes cannot commit simony, which declaration is heresy. He keeps a market by one Simon, an usurer, of ecclesiastic dignities and benefices. Contrary to Christ's charge to his Apostles, "My peace I leave with you," he has constantly stirred up and fomented discords and wars. On one occasion, when two parties had agreed to terms of peace, Boniface inhibited them and said, "If the Son

¹ This afterwards grew into a minute detail of all the famous wizards and sorcerers from whom he had obtained many different familiar spirits with whom he dealt: one was in a ring which he always wore, but offered to the King of Naples, who rejected the gift with pious abhorrence.

of God or Peter the Apostle had descended upon earth and given such precept, I would have replied, 'I believe you not.'” Like certain heretics who assert themselves to be the only true Christians, he called all others, especially that most Christian people the French, Paterins. He was a notorious sodomite. He had caused the murder of many clerks in his own presence, and urged his officers to their bloody work, saying, “Strike home! strike home!” He had refused the Eucharist, as unnecessary, to a nobleman in prison in his last agony. He had compelled priests to reveal confessions. He did not observe the Fasts of the Church, not even Lent. He depresses and always has depressed the whole Order of Cardinals, the Black and the White Monks, the Franciscan and Preaching Friars: he calls them all hypocrites. He never utters a good word, but words of scorn, lying reproach, and detraction against every bishop, monk, or ecclesiastic. He has conceived an old and implacable hatred against the King of France, and owned that he would subvert Christianity if he might humble what he calls the pride of the French. He has granted the tenths of his realm to the King of England, on condition of his waging war on France; he has leagued with Frederick of Arragon against the French King of Naples; he has granted the Empire to Albert of Austria, whom he had so long treated as unduly elected, as a traitor, and as a murderer, with the avowed purpose of employing him to crush the pride of the French. The Holy Land is lost through his fault; he has diverted the subsidies raised for the Christians of the Holy Land to enrich his kindred. He is the fountain and ground of all simony; he has reduced all prelates and

ecclesiastics to servitude, and loaded them with taxation; the wealth he has extorted from Christendom he has lavished on his own family, whom he has raised to the rank of counts and barons, and in building fortresses on the lands of Roman nobles, whom he has cruelly oppressed and driven into exile. He has dissolved many lawful marriages; he has promoted his nephew, a man of notoriously profligate life, to the Cardinalate, forced that nephew's wife to take a vow of chastity, and himself begotten upon her two bastard sons. He treated his holy predecessor Cœlestine with the utmost inhumanity, and caused his death. He has privately made away in prison with many others who denied his lawful election to the Papacy. To the public scandal he has allowed many nuns to return to a worldly life. He has also said that in a short time he would make all the French martyrs or apostates. Lastly, he seeks not the salvation, but the perdition of souls.¹

Each of these separate articles was declared to rest on public fame and notoriety, and so the accuser might seem in some degree to guard himself against personal responsibility for their truth. Still it is almost inconceivable how even such bold men, so fully possessed of the royal favor, could venture on some of these charges, so flagrantly false. The Colonnas, no doubt, whose wrongs were not forgotten, some of whom will soon be discovered in active league with Philip's Jurists, had disseminated these rumors of the Pope's tyrannies and cruel misdeeds in Italy, not improbably the enormities charged on his private life. The coarse artifice (skill it cannot be called) with which the vanity of the French

¹ Compare for all this Dupuy, *Preuves*.

nation is constantly appealed to ; the accumulation on one man of all the accusations which could be imagined as most odious to mankind ; were not merely ominous of danger to Boniface himself, but signs of the declining awe of the Popedom beyond the walls of Rome, beyond the confines of Italy. William of Plasian solemnly protested that he was actuated by no hatred or passion ; in the most formal manner he declared his adhesion to the appeal before made by William of Nogaret.

The King commanded his own appeal to be read. " We, Philip, King of France, having heard the charges now alleged by William of Plasian, as heretofore by William of Nogaret, against Boniface, now presiding over the Roman Church ; though we had rather cover the shame of our father with our garment, yet in the fervor of our Catholic faith, and our devotion to the Holy See, and to our Mother the Church, for which our ancestors have not hesitated to risk their lives, we cannot but assent to these requisitions : we will use our utmost power for the convocation of a General Council, in order to remove these scandals from the Church ; and we call upon and entreat, in the bowels of mercy in Jesus Christ, all you archbishops, bishops, and prelates, to join us in promoting this General Council ; and lest the aforesaid Boniface should utter sentences of excommunication or interdict, or any act of spiritual violence against us, our realm, our churches, our prelates, our barons, or our vassals, we appeal to this Great Council, and to a legitimate Pope."

No Churchman uttered one word of remonstrance. It might have been difficult to treat with scorn, or repel

with indignation, an arraignment made with such formal solemnity ; accusations openly recognized by the King as grave and serious subjects of inquiry. The Jurists had taken care that all was conducted according to unexceptionable rules of procedure. The prelates veiled their weak compliance with the King's wishes, their assent to the unusual act of permitting a Pope to be arraigned as a criminal for the most hateful and loathsome offences and denounced before a General Council, under the specious plea of the necessity of investigation into such fearful scandals, and the pious hope that the innocence of Boniface would appear. To this assent were signed the names of five archbishops — Nicosia (in Cyprus), a Frenchman by birth, Rheims, Sens, Narbonne, Tours ; of twenty-one bishops — Laon, Beauvais, Chalons-sur-Marne, Auxerre, Meaux, Nevers, Chartres, Orleans, Amiens, Terouanne, Senlis, Angers, Avranches, Coutances, Evreux, Lisieux, Seez, Clermont, Limoges, Puy, Macon (afterwards St. Omer, Boulogne, Ypres) ; eleven of the great abbots — Clugny, Premontrè, Marmoutier, Citeaux, St. Denis, Compiègne, St. Victor, St. Geneviève, St. Martin de Laon, Figeac, Beaulieu ; the Visitors of the Orders of the Temple and of St. John.¹

The King was not content with this general suffrage of the States-General, nor even with the mutual guarantee entered into between himself, the ecclesiastics,

¹ Dupuy, *Preuves*. Baillet published a special appeal of the Archbishop of Narbonne, containing ten charges against the Pope, in substance much the same with those of De Plasian, but darkening the charge of immorality into his having seduced two of his married nieces, by whom he had many children. "O patrem fœcundum !" It is said that this appeal was made in the States-General at the Louvre. Baillet found it among the Brienne papers ; but what proof is there of its authenticity ? Baillet, *Démêlés*, *Additions des Preuves*, p. 29.

and the barons of France, to stand by each other and coöperate in holding the General Council; in permitting no excommunication or interdict to be published within the realm, and to pay no regard to any mandate or Bull of the Pope. He appealed severally to all the ecclesiastical and monastic bodies of the realm. He obtained seven hundred acts of adhesion from ^{General ad-} bishops, chapters, conventual bodies, and the ^{hesion of the} Kingdom. ^{Kingdom.} Orders of friars. Of the numerous houses of the Clugniacs, seven only refused, eleven sent evasive answers. All who had hitherto been the most ardent and servile partisans of the Popedom, the Preachers the Sons of St. Dominic, the Minorites the Sons of St. Francis, the Templars and Hospitallers, were for the King. The University of Paris gave in its unqualified concurrence to the royal demands. Philip sent his appeal into some of the neighboring kingdoms. All these gave at least their tacit assent to the arraignment of the Pope before a General Council: some, no doubt, reconciled it to their conscience by doubts as to the validity of the election of Boniface, and his title to be considered a lawful Pope: all were careful that the appeal lay not merely to the Council, but to a future lawful Pope; all protested their fervent reverence and attachment to the Church, their loyalty to the See of Rome.

The Pope had retired, as usual, from the summer heats, perhaps not without mistrust of the ^{Boniface at} Romans, to his native city, Anagni. ^{Anagni.} There, ^{Consistory.} in a public consistory, he purged himself by ^{Aug. 16.} oath of the charge of heresy; the more scandalous accusations against his life and morals he disdained to notice. In the Bull issued from that consistory, he declared that he had received intelligence of the pro-

ceedings of the King and the Barons in the Louvre, of their appeal to a General Council, to a future lawful Pope, of their proclamation that they would receive neither legate nor letter from him, and their renunciation of all obedience. "With what sincerity, with what charity, with what zeal, this conventicle had acted, might be understood, by all who value truth, from the blasphemies which they had poured forth against him, and the open reception of his deadly enemy, Stephen Colonna. "They have lyingly blasphemed us with lying blasphemies, charging us with heresy, and with other monstrous criminalities over which they have affected to weep. Who in all the world has heard that we have been suspected of the taint of heresy? Which of our race, who in all Campania, has been branded with such a name? We were sound Catholics when he received favors from us. Valentinian the Emperor humbled himself before the Bishop of Milan: the King of France is as much below the Emperor as we are above the Bishop of Milan. The state of the Church will be utterly subverted, the Power of the Roman Pontiff annihilated, if such kings and princes, when the Roman Pontiff shall think it right to inflict correction upon them, shall presume to call him a heretic or of notoriously scandalous life, and so escape censure. This pernicious example must be cut up by the roots. Without us no General Council can be held. Henceforth no king, no prince, or other magnate of France shall dare, by the example of the King, to break out in words of blasphemy, and thus hope to clude due correction. Not to name the King of France deposed by Pope Zacharias, did Theodosius the Great, excommunicated by St. Ambrose, kindle

into wrath? Did the glorious Lothair lift up his heel against Pope Nicolas? or Frederick against Innocent?" In proper time and place he, Boniface, would proceed to the extreme censure, unless full satisfaction should be offered, lest the blood of Philip should be required at his hands.¹

The stress laid upon the reception of Stephen Colonna shows that Boniface knew whence sprung much of the most desperate hostility to his fame and authority. He was peculiarly indignant at the presumption of the Archbishop of Nicosia, whom he had ordered, and again ordered in a separate Bull, to return to his diocese, and not to presume to meddle in the affairs of France. A third Bull, to punish the prelates who had been seduced into rebellion by the King, suspended in all the ecclesiastical corporations the right of election, declared all vacant benefices at the sole disposal of the Pope, annulled all elections made during this suspension, and until the King should have returned to his obedience. A fourth deprived the Universities of the right of teaching, of granting any degree in theology, canon or civil law. This privilege the Pope declared to be derived entirely from the Apostolic See, and to have been forfeited by their rebellious adhesion to the cause of the King.²

Boniface seemed, as it were, to pause, to be gathering up his strength to launch the last crushing thunders upon the head of the contumacious King. The sentence of excommunication had been prepared; it had received the Papal Seal. It began with more than the usual solemnity and haughtiness.

¹ The Bull in Dupuy and Raynaldus, sub ann.

² Preuves. Raynaldus.

“We who sit on the high throne of St. Peter, the vicerent of Him to whom the Father said, ‘Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,’ ‘Ask of me, I will give Thee the nations as Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth as Thy possession: to bruise kings with a rod of iron, and to break them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.’ An awful admonition to kings! But the unlimited power of St. Peter has ever been exercised with serene lenity.” The Bull then recapitulates all the chief causes of the quarrel: the prohibition of the bishops to attend the Papal summons to Rome; the missions of James de Normannis Archdeacon of Narbonne, and of the Cardinal of St. Marcellinus rejected with scorn (it is silent as to the burning of the Bull), the seizure and imprisonment of Nicolas de Benefracto, the bearer of the Papal letters; the entertainment of Stephen Colonna at the Court in Paris. The King of France was declared excommunicate; his subjects released from their allegiance, or rather peremptorily inhibited from paying him any acts of obedience; all the clergy were forbidden, under pain of perpetual disability, to hold preferment, from receiving benefices at his hands; all such appointments were void, all leagues were annulled, all oaths abrogated, “and this our Bull is ordered to be suspended in the porch of the Cathedral of Anagni.” The 8th of September was the fatal day.¹

Boniface, infatuated by the sense of his unapproachable majesty, and of the sanctity of his office, had taken no precautions for the safeguard of his person. He could not but know that his two deadliest enemies, William of Nogaret, the most

William of
Nogaret and
Sciarra
Colonna.

¹ Preuves, p. 182.

daring of Philip's legal counsellors, and Sciarra Colonna, the most fierce and desperate of the house, which he had driven to desperation, had been for several months in Italy, on the Tuscan borders at no great distance from Rome. They were accompanied by Musciatto dei Francesi, in whose castle of Staggia, not far from Sienna, they had taken up their abode. They had unlimited power to draw on the Panizzi, the merchant bankers of the King of France at Florence. To the simple peasantry they held out that their mission was to reconcile the Pope with the King of France; others supposed that they were delegated to serve upon the Pope the citation to appear before the General Council. They bought with their gold many of the petty barons of Romagna. They hired to be at their command a band of the lawless soldiery who had been employed in the late wars. They had their emissaries in Anagni; some even of the Cardinals had not been inaccessible to their dark intrigues.

On a sudden, on the 7th September (the 8th was the day for the publication of the Bull), the peaceful streets of Anagni were disturbed. The Pope and the Cardinals, who were all assembled around him, were startled with the trampling of armed horse, and the terrible cry, which ran like wildfire through the city, "Death to Pope Boniface! Long live the King of France!" Sciarra Colonna, at the head of three hundred horsemen, the Barons of Cercano and Supino, and some others, the sons of Master Massio of Anagni, were marching in furious haste, with the banner of the King of France displayed. The ungrateful citizens of Anagni, forgetful of their pride in their holy compatriot, of the honor and advantage to their town from

the splendor and wealth of the Papal residence, received them with rebellious and acclaiming shouts.

The bell of the city, indeed, had tolled at the first alarm; the burghers had assembled; they had chosen their commander; but that commander, whom they ignorantly or treacherously chose, was Arnulf, a deadly enemy of the Pope. The banner of the Church was unfolded against the Pope by the captain of the people of Anagni.¹ The first attack was on the palace of the Pope, on that of the Marquis Gaetani, his nephew, and those of three Cardinals, the special partisans of Boniface. The houses of the Pope and of his nephew made some resistance. The doors of those of the Cardinals were beaten down, the treasures ransacked and carried off; the Cardinals themselves fled from the backs of the houses through the common sewer. Then arrived, but not to the rescue, Arnulf, the Captain of the People; he had perhaps been suborned by Reginald of Supino. With him were the sons of Chiton, whose father was pining in the dungeons of Boniface.² Instead of resisting, they joined the attack on the palace of the Pope's nephew and his own. The Pope and his nephew implored a truce; it was granted for eight hours. This time the Pope employed in endeavoring to stir up the people to his defence: the people coldly answered that they were under the command of their Captain. The Pope demanded the terms of the conspirators. "If the Pope would save his life, let him instantly restore the Colonna Cardinals to their dignity, and reinstate the whole house in their honors and pos-

¹ Statement of William of Nogaret. Dupuy, p. 247. I see no reason to doubt this.

² The Chiton of Walsingham is probably the Massio of Villani.

BOOK XII.

CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

POPES.		EMPERORS.		KINGS OF FRANCE.		KINGS OF ENGLAND.		KINGS OF SCOTLAND.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1305 Clement V. 1314		1298 Albert of Austria 1307				Edward I. 1307 1307 Edward II. 1327		1306 Robert I. (Bruce) 1329	
Vacancy.		1303 Vacant. 1304 Henry of Luxembourg 1313		Philip the Fair 1314					
1316 John XXII. 1334		1314 Louis of Bavaria 1347		1314 Louis le Hutin 1315 John I. 1316 Philip the Long 1321		1327 Edward III. 1377			
		(Frederick of Austria.)		1321 Charles IV. the Fair 1328		ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.		1329 David II.	
1334 Benedict XII. 1342				1328 Philip of Valois 1351		1294 Robert of Winchelsey 1313 1313 Walter Reynolds. 1327 Simon Mepham. 1333 John Stratford. 1348 Thomas Bradwardine. 1349 Simon Islip. 1360 Simon Langham. 1367 William Whittlesey. 1375 Simon Sudbury.			
1342 Clement VI. 1352		1347 Charles IV. of Luxembourg 1378		1351 John II. 1364					
1352 Innocent VI. 1362				1364 Charles IV. 1380					
1362 Urban V. 1370								1370 Robert II.	
1370 Gregory XI. 1378									
KINGS OF SPAIN.		KINGS OF PORTUGAL.		KINGS OF SWEDEN.		KINGS OF POLAND.		EASTERN EMPERORS.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
CASTILE. Ferdinand IV. 1312		Dionysius 1325		Berger II. 1326		1305 Ladislaus IV.		Andronicus Palaeologus 1320	
1312 Alfonso XII. 1350		1325 Alfonso IV. 1357		1326 Magnus III.		1333 Casimir the Great.		1320 Andronicus II. Palaeologus 1341	
1350 Peter the Cruel.		1357 Peter the Cruel 1367		1364 Albert.		1370 Louis of Hungary.		1341 John V. Palaeologus.	
1369 Henry the Bastard		1367 Ferdinand I.							
ARRAGON.				KINGS OF DENMARK.					
A.D.	A.D.			A.D.	A.D.				
James the Just. 1327				Erick VIII. 1321					
1327 Alphonso IV. 1336				1321 Christopher 1333					
1336 Peter IV. 1380				1333 Waldemar.					

BOOK XII.

THE POPES IN AVIGNON.



CHAPTER I.

CLEMENT V.

THE period in the Papal history has arrived which in the Italian writers is called the Babylonish captivity: it lasted more than seventy years.¹ Rome is no longer the Metropolis of Christendom; the Pope is a French Prelate. The successor of St. Peter is not on St. Peter's throne; he is environed with none of the traditional majesty or traditional sanctity of the Eternal City; he has abandoned the holy bodies of the Apostles, the churches of the Apostles. It is perhaps the most marvellous part of its history, that the Papacy, having sunk so low, sank no lower; that it recovered its degradation; that, from a satellite, almost a slave, of the King of France, the Pontiff ever emerged again to be an independent potentate; and, although the great line of mediæval Popes, of Gregory, of Alexander III., and the Innocents, expired in Boniface VIII., he could resume even his modified supremacy. There is no proof so strong of the vitality of the Papacy as that it could establish the law that wherever the Pope is, there is the throne of St. Peter; that he could cease to be

¹ From 1305 to 1376.

Bishop of Rome in all but in name, and then take back again the abdicated Bishopric.

Never was revolution more sudden, more total, it might seem more enduring in its consequences. The close of the last century had seen Boniface VIII. advancing higher pretensions, if not wielding more actual power, than any former Pontiff; the acknowledged pacificator of the world, the arbiter between the Kings of France and England, claiming and exercising feudal as well as spiritual supremacy over many kingdoms, bestowing crowns as in Hungary, awarding the Empire; with millions of pilgrims at the Jubilee in Rome, still the centre of Christendom, paying him homage which bordered on adulation, and pouring the riches of the world at his feet. The first decade of the new century is not more than half passed; Pope Clement V. is a voluntary prisoner, but not the less a prisoner, in the realm, or almost within the precincts of France; struggling in vain to escape from the tyranny of his inexorable master, and to break or elude the fetters wound around him by his own solemn engagements. He is almost forced to condemn his predecessor for crimes of which he could hardly believe him guilty; to accept a niggardly, and perhaps never-fulfilled, penance from men almost murderers of a Pope; to sacrifice, on evidence which he himself manifestly mistrusted, one of the great military orders of Christendom to the hatred or avarice of Philip. The Pope, from Lord over the freedom of the world, had ceased to be a free agent.

The short Pontificate of Benedict XI., had exasperated, rather than allayed, the divisions in the Conclave. Conclave.¹ The terrible fate of the two last Popes

¹ There were now nineteen Cardinals, according to Ciacconius, exclusive

had not cooled down the eager competition for the perilous dignity. The Cardinals assembled at Perugia. The two factions, the French and that of the partisans and kindred of Boniface VIII., were headed, the latter by Matteo Orsini and Francesco Gaetani, brother of the late Pope, the former by Napoleon Orsini and the Cardinal da Prato.¹ The Colonna Cardinals had not yet been permitted to resume their place in the Conclave. The elder, James Colonna, had lived in seclusion, if not in concealment, at Perugia. He came forth from his hiding-place; he summoned his nephew, who had found an asylum at Padua, to his aid. They had an unlimited command of French money. But this money could hold, it could not turn, the balance between the two Orsini, each of whom aspired to be, or to create the Pope. The Conclave met, it separated, it met again; they wrangled, intrigued; each faction strove, but in vain, to win the preponderance by stubbornness or by artifice, by bribery in act or promise.² Months wore away. At length the people of Perugia grew weary of the delay: they surrounded the Conclave; threatened to keep the Cardinals as prisoners; demanded with loud outcries a Pope; any hour they might proceed to worse violence: by one account they unroofed the house in which the Cardinals sat, and cut off their provisions.³ One day the Cardinal da Prato accosted Francesco Gaetani, "We are doing

of the Colonnas. One of the former Conclave had died. Pope Benedict had named two, the Cardinal of Prato (Ostia and Velletri), and an Englishman, Walter Winterburn of Salisbury.

¹ Ferretus Vicentinus, Murat. R. I. S. p. 1014.

² "Ut multum valet aurea persuasio, quæque constat in donis expectata fiducia." — Ferret. Vicent.

³ Ibid. p. 4015.

sore wrong : it is an evil and a scandal to Christendom to deprive it so long of its Chief Pastor." "It rests not with us," replied Gaetani. "Will you Compact. accede to any reasonable scheme which may reconcile our differences?" The Cardinal da Prato then proposed that one party should name three Ultramontane (Northern) Prelates, not of the Sacred College, on one of whom the adverse party should pledge itself to unite its suffrages. Gaetani consented, on condition that the Bonifacians should name the three Prelates. They were named ; among the three the Archbishop of Bordeaux.

Bernard de Goth had been raised by Boniface VIII. from the small bishopric of Comminges to the archiepiscopal seat of Bordeaux. As a subject of the King of England, he owed only a more remote allegiance to his suzerain, the King of France.¹ He was committed in some personal hostility with Charles of Valois. Throughout the strife between the Pope and the King he had been on the Pope's side. He had withdrawn in disguise from the Court in order to obey the Pope's summons to Rome : he was among the Prelates assembled in November at Rome. If there were any Transalpine Prelate whom the kindred and friends of Boniface might suppose secure to their party, from his inclinations, his gratitude, his animosities, his former conduct, it was Bernard de Goth. But the sagacious Cardinal da Prato knew the man ; he knew the Gascon character. Forty days were to elapse before the election. In eleven days a courier was in Paris. Interview of King and Archbishop. In six days more the King and the Arch-

¹ Yet it is said, "*Licet in Anglicâ regione præsul esset, tamen Philippo gratissimus, quod a juventute familiaris extitisset.*" — Ferret. Vicent.

bishop of Bordeaux, each with a few chosen attendants, met in a forest belonging to the Monastery of St. Jean d'Angely. The secrets of that interview are related, perhaps with suspicious particularity. Yet the King, having achieved his purpose, was not likely to conceal his part in the treaty, especially from his secret counsellors, who had possibly some interest to divulge, none to conceal, the whole affair. The King began by requesting the reconciliation of the Archbishop with Charles of Valois. He then opened the great subject of the interview. He showed to the dazzled eyes of the Prelate the despatch of the Cardinal da Prato. "One word from me, and you are Pope." But the King insisted on six conditions:—I. His own full and complete reconciliation with the Church. II. The absolution of all persons whom he had employed in his strife with Boniface. III. The tenths for five years from the clergy of the realm. IV. The condemnation of the memory of Boniface. V. The reinvestment of the Colonnas in the rank and honors of the Cardinalate. The VIth and last was a profound secret, which he reserved for himself to claim when the time of its fulfilment should be come. That secret has never been fully revealed. Some have thought, and not without strong ground, that Philip already meditated the suppression of the Templars. The cautious King was not content with the acquiescence, or with the oath, of the Archbishop, an oath from which, as Pope, he might release himself. De Goth was solemnly sworn upon the Host: he gave up his brother and two nephews as hostages. Before thirty-five days had passed, the Cardinal da Prato had secret intelligence of the compact. They proceeded to the ballot; Bernard de

June 5, 1305.

Goth was unanimously chosen Pope. In the Cathedral of Bordeaux he took the name of Clement V.

The first ominous warning to the Italian Prelates was a summons to attend the coronation of the new Pope, not at Rome or in Italy, but at Lyons. The Cardinal Matteo Orsini is said to have uttered a sad vaticination: "It will be long before we behold the face of another Pope."¹ Clement began his slow progress towards Lyons at the end of August. He passed through Agen, Toulouse, Beziers, Montpellier, and Nismes. The monasteries which were compelled to lodge and entertain the Pope and all his retinue murmured at the pomp and luxury of his train: many of them were heavily impoverished by this enforced hospitality. At Montpellier he received the homage of the Kings of Majorca and Arragon: he confirmed the King of Arragon in the possession of the islands of Corsica and Sardinia, and received his oath of fealty. He had invited to his coro- Oct. 7.

nation his two sovereigns, the Kings of France and England. The King of England alleged important affairs in Scotland as an excuse for not doing honor to his former vassal. The Kings of France and Majorca were present. On the Cardinal Matteo Orsini, Italian, Roman, to the heart, devolved the office of Nov. 14.
Coronation
at Lyons.
crowning the Gascon Pope, whose aversion
to Italy he well knew. The Pope rode in solemn state from the Church of St. Just in the royal castle of Lyons to the palace prepared for him. The King of France at first held his bridle, and then yielded the post of humble honor to his brothers, Charles of Valois, and Louis of Evreux, and to the Duke of Bretagne.

¹ VI. Vit. Clement. apud Baluz.

The pomp was interrupted by a dire and ominous calamity. An old wall fell as they passed. The Pope was thrown from his horse, but escaped unhurt: his gorgeous crown rolled in the mire. The Duke of Bretagne, with eleven or twelve others, was killed: Charles of Valois seriously hurt.

Clement V. hastened to fulfil the first of his engagements to the King of France, perhaps designing by this ready zeal to avert, elude, or delay the accomplishment of those which were more difficult or more humiliating. The King of France had plenary absolution: he was received as again the favored son and protector of the Church. To the King were granted the tenths on all the revenues of the Church of France for five years. The Colonnas were restored to their dignity; they resumed the state, dress, and symbols of the Cardinalate, and took their place in the Sacred College. A promotion of ten Cardinals showed what interest was hereafter to prevail in the Conclave. Among the ten were the Bishops of Toulouse and Beziers, the Archbishop (Elect) of Bordeaux and the nephew of the Pope, the King's Confessor Nicolas de Francavilla, the King's Chancellor Stephen, Archdeacon of Bruges. A French Pope was to be surrounded by a French Court.

Measure followed measure to propitiate the Pope's master. Of the two famous Bulls, that denominated "Clericis Laicos" was altogether abrogated, as having been the cause of grievous scandals, dangers, and inconveniences. The old decrees of the Lateran and other Councils concerning the taxation of the clergy were declared to be the law of the Church. As to the other, the "Unam Sanctam," the dearest beloved son

Philip of France, for his loyal attachment to the Church of Rome, had deserved that the Pope should declare this statute to contain nothing to his prejudice ; that he, his realm, and his people, were exactly in the same state, as regarded the See of Rome, as before the promulgation of that Bull.

But there were two articles of the compact, besides the secret one, yet unaccomplished, the complete absolution of all the King's agents in the quarrel with the Pope, and the condemnation of the memory of Boniface. The Pope writhed and struggled in vain in the folds of his deathly embarrassment. The King of France could not in honor, he was not disposed by temper to abandon the faithful executioners of his mandates : he might want them for other remorseless services. He could not retreat or let fall the accusations against the deceased Pope. Philip was compelled, like other persecutors, to go on in his persecution. This immitigable, seemingly vindictive, hostility to the fame of Boniface was his only justification. If those high crimes and misdemeanors of which the Pope had been arraigned, those heresies, immoralities, cruelties, enormities, were admitted to be groundless, or dropped as not thought worthy of proof, the seizure at Anagni became a barbarous, cowardly, and unnecessary outrage on a defenceless old man, an impious sacrilege : William of Nogaret and his accomplices were base and cruel assassins.

Already, before the death of Benedict, William of Nogaret had issued one strong protest against his condemnation. During the vacancy he ^{William of Nogaret.} allowed no repose to the memory of Boniface, and justified himself against the terrible anathema of Bene-

dict. He appeared before the official of his diocesan, the Bishop of Paris, and claimed absolution from a censure issued by the Pope under false information. He promulgated two memorials: in the first he adduced sixty heads of accusation against Boniface; in the second he protested at great length against the rash proceedings of Pope Benedict. The Bull of Benedict had cited him to appear at Rome on the Festival of St. Peter and St. Paul. He excused his contumacy in not appearing: he was in France, the citation had not been served upon him; and also by reason of the death of the Pope, as well as on account of his powerful enemies in Italy. Nogaret entered into an elaborate account of his own intercourse with Pope Boniface. Five years before, he had been the King's ambassador to announce the treaty of Philip with Albert, King of the Romans. The Pope demanded Tuscany as the price of his consent to that alliance. It was then that William of Nogaret heard at Rome the vices and misdeeds of the Pope, of which he was afterwards arraigned, and had humbly implored the Pope to desist from his simonies and extortions. The Pope had demanded whether he spoke in his own name or in that of the King. Nogaret had replied, in his own, out of his great zeal for the Church. The Pope had roared with passion, like a madman, and had heaped on him menaces, insults, and blasphemies.¹

Nogaret treats the refusal of Boniface to appear before the Council when first summoned at Anagni as an act of contumacy; he therefore (Nogaret) was justified in using force towards a contumacious criminal. He asserts that he saved the life of Boniface when others

¹ Preuves, p. 252.

would have killed him; that he tried to protect the treasure, of which he had not touched a penny; he had kept the Pope with a decent attendance, and supplied him with food and drink. Had he slain the wicked usurper he had been justified, as Phineas who pleased the Lord, as Abraham who slew the Kings, Moses the Egyptian, the Maccabees the enemies of God. Pope Benedict had complained of the loss of his treasure, he ought rather to have complained that so vast a treasure had been wrung by cruel exactions from the impoverished churches. He asserts that for all his acts he had received absolution from Boniface himself. For all these reasons he appealed to a General Council in the vacancy of the Pontificate, and demanded absolution from the unjust censures of the misinformed Pope Benedict.

William of Nogaret was necessary, as other men of his stamp, for meditated acts of the King, not less cruel or less daring than the surprisal at Anagni and the abasement of the Supreme Pontiff. The King of France, ever rapacious, yet ever ^{King's dis-}
^{tresses} necessitous, who must maintain his schemes, his ambition, his wars in Flanders at lavish cost, but with hardly any certain income but that of the royal domains, had again taken to that coarse expedient of barbarous finance, the debasement of the coin. There were now two standards: in the higher the King and the Nobles exacted the payments of their subjects and vassals; the lower the subjects and vassals were obliged to receive as current money. Everywhere was secret or clamorous discontent, aggravated by famine;¹ discontent in Paris and Orleans rose to insurrection,

¹ During the winter 1304-5.

which endangered the King's government, even his person, and was only put down by extreme measures of cruelty. The King was compelled to make concessions, to content himself to be paid in the lower coin. But some time had elapsed since the usual financial resource in times of difficulty had been put in force. The Jews had had leisure to become again alluringly rich. William of Nogaret proceeded with his usual rapid resolution. In one day all the Jews were seized, their property confiscated to the Crown, the race expelled the realm. The clergy, in their zeal for the faith, and the hope that their own burdens might be lightened, approved this pious robbery, and rejoiced that France was delivered from the presence of this usurious and miscreant race. William of Nogaret had atoned for some at least of his sins.¹ But even this was not his last service.

Pope Clement, in the mean time, hastened to return to Bordeaux. He passed by a different road, through Macon, Clugny, Nevers, Bourges, Limoges, again severely taxing by the honor of his entertainment all the great monasteries and chapters on his way. The Archbishop of Bourges was so reduced as to accept the pittance of a Canon. At Bordeaux the Pope was in the dominions of England, and to Edward of England he showed himself even a more obsequious vassal than to the King of France. He could perhaps secure Edward's protection if too hardly pressed by his inexorable master, the King of France. He gave to England. Edward plenary absolution from all his oaths to maintain the Charters (the Great Charter and the

¹ Ordonnances des Rois, i. 443, 447. Vita Clementis. Continuator. Nangis, p. 594. Raynald. sub ann. 1306, c. 29.

Charter of Forests) extorted from him, as was asserted, by his disloyal subjects.¹ Afterwards, casting aside all the haughty pretensions of Pope Boniface, he excommunicated Robert Bruce, now engaged in his gallant strife for the crown of Scotland.²

But the Pope could not decline the commanding invitation of King Philip to an interview within June, 1307. the realm of France, at Poitiers. To that city he went, but soon repented of having placed himself so completely within the King's power. He attempted to make an honorable retreat ; he was retained with courteous force, and overwhelmed with specious honor and reverence.

A Congress of Princes might seem assembled to show their flattering respect to the Pontiff:—Philip, with his three sons, his brothers Charles of Valois and Louis Count of Evreux, Robert Count of Flanders, Charles King of Naples, the ambassadors of Edward King of England. Clement, by the prodigality of his concessions, endeavored to avert the fatal question, the condemnation of Boniface. He was seized with a sudden ardor to place Charles of Valois on the throne of Constantinople, in right of his wife, Isabella of Courtenay. He declared himself the head of a new Crusade, addressed Bulls to all Christendom, in order to expel the feeble Andronicus from the throne, which must fall under the power of the Turks and Saracens, unless filled by a powerful Christian Emperor. He pronounced his anathema against Andronicus. He awarded the kingdom of Hungary to Charobert, grandson of the King of Naples. He took the first steps for the canonization of Louis, the second son of Charles, who had

¹ Rymer.

² Rymer.

died Archbishop of Toulouse in the odor of sanctity. He remitted the vast debt owed by the King of Naples to the Papal See, which amounted to 360,000 ounces of gold; a third was absolutely annulled, the rest assigned to the Crusade of Charles of Valois.¹

But the inflexible Philip was neither to be diverted nor dissuaded from exacting the full terms of his bond. He offered to prove forty-three articles of heresy against Boniface; he demanded that the body of the Pope should be disinterred and burned, the ignominious fate of heretics, which he had undeservedly escaped during life. Even the French Cardinals saw and deprecated the fatal consequences of such a proceeding to the Church. All the acts of Boniface, his bulls, decrees, promotions, became questionable. The College of Cardinals was dissolved, at least the nomination of almost all became precarious. The title of Clement himself was doubtful. The effects of breaking the chain of traditional authority were incalculable, interminable. The Supplement to the Canon Law, the Sixth Book of Decretals, at once the most unanswerable proof of the orthodoxy of Boniface and the most full assertion of the rights of the Church, fell to the ground. The foundations of the Papal power were shaken to the base. By the wise advice of the Cardinal da Prato, Clement determined to dissemble and so gain time. Philip himself had demanded a General Council of all Christendom. A General Council alone of all Christendom could give dignity and authority to a decree so weighty and unprecedented as the condemnation of a Pope. They only could investigate such judgment. In such an assembly the Prelates of the Chris-

Council of
Vienne de-
termined on.

¹ Acta apud Baluzium, xxv.

tian world, French, English, Germans, Italians, Spaniards, might meet; and the Church, in her full liberty, and with irrefragable solemnity, decide the awful cause. He named the city of Vienne in Dauphiny as the seat of this Great Council. In the mean time he strove to conciliate the counsellors who ruled the mind of Philip. William of Nogaret and his accomplices received full absolution for all their acts in the seizure of Boniface and the plunder of the Papal treasures, on condition of certain penances to be assigned by some of the Cardinals. William of Nogaret was to take arms in the East against the Saracens, and not to return without permission of the Holy See; but he was allowed five years' delay before he was called on to fulfil this penitential Crusade.¹

The Pope could breathe more freely: he had gained time, and time was inestimable. Who could know what it might bring forth? Even the stubborn hatred of Philip might be, if not mitigated, distracted to some other object. That object seemed to arise at once, great, of absorbing public interest, ministering excitement to all Philip's dominant passions, a religious object of the most surprising, unprecedented, almost appalling nature, and of the most dubious justice and policy, the abolition of the great Order of the Knights Templars. The secret of the last stipulation in the covenant between the King and the Pope remained with themselves; what it was, and whether it was really demanded, was not permitted to transpire. Was it this destruction of the Templars? No one knew; yet all had their conjecture. Or was it some yet remoter scheme, the elevation of his brother or himself to the

¹ Raynaldus, sub ann. 1307, c. xi.

Imperial throne? It was still a dark, profound, and so more stimulating mystery.

The famous Order of the Temple of Jerusalem had sprung, like all the other great religious institutions of the middle ages, from the humblest origin. Their ancestors were a small band of nine French Knights,¹ engaged on a chivalrous adventure, sworn to an especial service, the protection of the Christian pilgrims to the Holy Sepulchre through the dangerous passes between Jerusalem and the Jordan, that they might bathe, unmolested by the marauding Moslem, in the holy waters. The Templars had become, in almost every kingdom of the West, a powerful, wealthy, and formidable republic, governed by their own laws, animated by the closest corporate spirit, under the severest internal discipline, and an all-pervading organization; independent alike of the civil power and of the spiritual hierarchy. It was a half-military, half-monastic community. The three great monastic vows, implicit obedience to their superiors, chastity, the abandonment of all personal property, were the fundamental statutes of the Order: while, instead of the peaceful and secluded monastery, the contemplative, devotional, or studious life, their convents were strong castles, their life that of the camp or the battle-field, their occupation chivalrous exercises or adventures, war in preparation, or war in all its fierceness and activity. The nine brethren in arms were now fifteen thousand of the bravest, best-trained, most experienced soldiers in the world; armed, horsed, ac-

¹ A.D. 1118. Hugo di Payens, Godfrey de St. Omer, Raoul. Godfrey Bisol, Pagans de Montdidier, Archembold de St. Aman, Andrew, Gundomar, Hugh Count of Provence. — Wilcke, *Geschichte des Tempelherren Ordens*, p. 9.

counted in the most perfect and splendid fashion of the times ; isolated from all ties or interests with the rest of mankind ; ready at the summons of the Grand Master to embark on any service ; the one aim the power, aggrandizement, enrichment of the Order.

St. Bernard, in his devout enthusiasm, had beheld in the rise of the Templars a permanent and invincible Crusade. The Order (with its rival brotherhood, the Knights of the Hospital or of St. John) was in his view a perpetual sacred militia, which would conquer and maintain the sepulchre of the Lord, become the body-guard of the Christian Kings of Jerusalem, the standing army on the outposts of Christendom. His eloquent address to the soldiers of the temple¹ was at once the law and the vivid expression of the dominant sentiments of his time ; here, as in all things, his age spake in St. Bernard. From that time the devout admiration of Western Christendom in heaping the most splendid endowments of lands, castles, riches of all kinds, on the Knights of the Temple and of the Hospital, supposed that it was contributing in the most efficient manner to the Holy Wars. Successive Popes, the most renowned and wise, especially Innocent III., notwithstanding occasional signs of mistrust and jealousy of their augmenting power, had vied with each other in enlarging the privileges and raising the fame of the Knights of the Temple. Eugenius III., under the influence of St. Bernard, first issued a Bull in their favor ; but their great Charter, which invested them in their A.D. 1172. most valuable rights and privileges,² was issued by

¹ Refer back to vol. iv. 251. *Sermo ad Milites Templi*, Opera, p. 830.

² The Bull, *Omne datum optimum*. Compare Wilcke, p. 77. It is translated by Mr. Addison, the *Knights Templars*, p. 70.

Alexander III. They had already ceased to be a lay community, and therefore under spiritual subjection to the clergy. The clergy had been admitted in considerable numbers into the Order, and so their own body administered within themselves all the rites and sacraments of religion. Innocent III. released the clergy in the Order of the Templars from their oath of fidelity and obedience to their Bishop; henceforth they owed allegiance to the Pope alone.¹ Honorius III. prohibited all Bishops from excommunicating any Knight Templar, or laying an interdict on their churches or houses. Gregory IX., Innocent IV., Alexander III., Clement IV. maintained their absolute exemption from episcopal authority. The Grand Master and the brotherhood of the Temple were subordinate only to the supreme head of Christendom. Gregory X. crowned their privileges with an exemption from all contributions to the Holy War, and from the tenths paid by the rest of Christendom for this sacred purpose. The pretence was that their whole lands and wealth were held on that tenure.²

Nearly two hundred years³ had elapsed since the foundation of the Order, two hundred years of slow, imperceptible, but inevitable change. The Knights Templars fought in the Holy Land with consummate valor, discipline, activity, and zeal; but they fought for themselves, not for the common cause of Christianity.

¹ Innocent III., Epist. i. 508, ii. 35, 84, 257, 259. To the Bishops, "Quatenus a capellanis ecclesiarum, quæ pleno jure jam dictis fratribus sunt concessæ, nec fidelitatem, nec obedientiam exigatis, quia Romano tantum Pontifici sunt subjecti."

² "Cum vos ad hoc principaliter laboratis, ut vos pariter et omnia quæ habetis pro ipsius terræ sanctæ defensione, ac Christianæ fidei exponatis, vos eximere a præstatione hujusmodi (decimæ pro terrâ sanctâ) de benignitate Apostolicâ curaremus." — Compare Wilcke, ii. p. 195.

³ 1118 — 1307.

They were an independent army, owing no subordination to the King or Bishop of Jerusalem, or to any of the Sovereigns who placed themselves at the head of a Crusade. They supported or thwarted, according to their own views, the plans of campaigns, joined vigorously in the enterprise, or stood aloof in sullen disapprobation: they made or broke treaties. Thus formidable to the enemies of the faith, they were not less so to its champions. There was a constant rivalry with the Knights of St. John, not of generous emulation, but of power and even of sordid gain. During the expedition of Frederick II. the Master of the Templars and the whole Order had espoused the cause of the Pope. To their stubborn opposition was attributed, no doubt with much justice, the failure or rather the imperfect success of that Crusade.

The character of the war in the East had also changed, unnoticed, unobserved. There was no longer the implacable mutual aversion, or rather abhorrence, with which the Christian met the Saracen, the Saracen the Christian; from which the Christian thought that by slaying the Saracen he was avenging the cause of his Redeemer, and washing off his own sins; the Saracen that in massacring the Christian, or trampling on the Christian dog, he was acting according to the first principles of his faith, and winning Paradise. This traditionary, almost inborn, antipathy had worn away by long intermingling, and given place to the courtesies and mutual respect of a more chivalrous warfare. The brave and generous Knight could not but admire bravery and generosity in his antagonist. The accidents of war led to more intimate acquaintance, acquaintance to hospitable even to social intercourse, social inter-

course to a fairer estimation of the better qualities on both sides. The prisoner was not always reduced to a cruel and debasing servitude, or shut up in a squalid dungeon. He became the guest, the companion, of his high-minded captor. A character like that of Saladin, which his fiercest enemies could not behold without awe and admiring wonder, must have softened the detestation with which it was once the duty of the Christian to look on the Unbeliever. The lofty toleration of Frederick II. might offend the more zealous by its approximation to indifference, but was not altogether uncongenial to the dominant feeling. How far had that indifference, which was so hardly reproached against Frederick, crept into the minds and hearts of Frederick's most deadly enemies? How far had Mohammedanism lost its odious and repulsive character to the Templars? and begun to appear not as a monstrous and wicked idolatry to be refuted only with the good sword, but as a sublime and hardly irrational Theism? How far had Oriental superstitions, belief in magic, in the power of amulets and talismans, divination, mystic signs and characters, dealings with genii or evil spirits, seized on the excited imaginations of those adventurous but rude warriors of the West, and mingled with that secret ceremonial which was designed to impress upon the initiated the inflexible discipline of the Order?

Oriental
manners.

How far were the Templars orientalized by their domiciliation in the East? Had their morals escaped the taint of Oriental license? Vows of chastity were very different to men of hot blood, inflamed by the sun of the East, in the freedom of the camp or the marauding expedition, provoked by the sack and plunder of towns, the irruption into the luxu-

rious harems of their foes; and to monks in close-watched seclusion, occupied every hour of the day and night with religious services, emaciated by the fast and scourge, and become, as it were, the shadows of men. If even Western devotees were so apt, as was ever the case, to degenerate into debauchery, the individual Templar at least would hardly maintain his austere and impeccable virtue. Those unnatural vices, which it offends Christian purity even to allude to, but which are looked upon if not with indulgence, at least without the same disgust in the East, were chiefly charged upon the Templars. Yet after all, it was the pride rather than the sensuality of the Order which was their characteristic and proverbial crime. Richard I., who must have known them well in the East, bequeathed not his avarice, or his lust, but his pride, to the Knights of the Temple.

But the Templars were not a great colony of warriors transplanted and settled in the East as their permanent abode, having broken off all connection with their native West. They were powerful feudal lords, lords of castles and domains and estates, a self-governed community in all the kingdoms of Europe. Hence their total expulsion, with the rest of the Christian establishments, from Palestine, left them not, ^{Loss of Palestine.} as might have been expected, without home, without possessions, discharged, as it were, from their mission by its melancholy and ignominious failure. The loss of the Temple, the irretrievable loss, might seem to imply the dissolution of the defenders of the Temple: it might be thought to disband and disclaim them as useless and worn-out veterans. The bitter disappointment of the Christian world at that loss would attribute the shame,

the guilt, to those whose especial duty it was, the very charter of their foundation, to protect it. That guilt was unanswerably shown by God's visible wrath. His abandonment of the tomb of his Blessed Son was a proof which could not be gainsaid, that the Christians, those especially designated for the glorious service, were unworthy of that honor. Any charge of wickedness so denounced, it might seem, by God himself, would find ready hearing.

The Knights of the Hospital, more fortunate or more sagacious, had found an occupation for their arms, of which perhaps themselves did not appreciate the full importance, the conquest of Rhodes. Their establishment in that island became the bulwark, long the unconquerable outpost of Christendom in the East. The Templars, if they did not altogether stand aloof from that enterprise, disdained to act a secondary part, and to aid in subduing for their rivals that in which those rivals would claim exclusive dominion.¹

Clement V., soon after his accession, had summoned the Grand Masters of the two Orders to Europe, under the pretext of consulting them on the affairs of the East, on succors to be afforded to the King of Armenia, and on plans which had been already formed for the union of the two Orders. It does not appear whether, either with a secret understanding with the King of France, or of his own accord, he as yet contemplated hostile measures against the Order. He declares himself, that while at Lyons he had heard reports unfavorable both to the faith and to the conduct of the Templars: but he had rejected with disdain all impeachment against

¹ Raynald. sub ann. 1306.

an Order which had warred so valiantly and shed so much noble blood in defence of the Sepulchre of the Lord. His invitation was couched in the smoothest terms of religious adulation.¹

Du Molay,² Grand Master of the Order, manifestly altogether unsuspecting, obeyed the Papal Du Molay. invitation. The Grand Master of the Hospitallers alleged his engagement in the siege of Rhodes. But if Du Molay had designed to precipitate the fall of his Order, he could not have followed a more fatal course of policy. His return to Europe was not that of the head of an institution whose occupation and special function was in the East, and who held all they possessed on the tenure of war against the Moslemin. He might rather seem an independent Prince, intending to take up his permanent abode and live in dignity and wealth on their ample domains, or rather territories, in Europe. He might seem almost wantonly to alarm the jealous apprehensions, and stimulate the insatiable rapacity of Philip the Fair. He assembled around him in Cyprus a retinue of sixty, the most distinguished Knights of the Order, collected a great mass of treasure, and left the Marshal of the Order as Regent in that island. In this state, having landed in the south, and made his slow progress through France, he entered the capital, and proceeded to the mansion of Entry into Paris. the Order, in Paris as well as in London perhaps the most spacious, the strongest, and even most magnificent edifice in the city. The treasure which

¹ "De quorum circumspectâ probitate, et probatâ circumspectione ac vulgatâ fidelitate, fiduciam tenemus." So wrote Clement V. The letter is in Raynaldus, date June 6, 1306.

² See in Raynouard, *Monuments Historiques*, p. 15 *et seq.*, the life and services of Du Molay.

Du Molay brought was reported to amount to the enormous sum of one hundred and fifty thousand golden florins and a vast quantity of silver. The populace wondered at the long train of sumpter horses,¹ as they moved through the narrow streets to the Temple citadel, which confronted the Louvre in its height and strength. Du Molay was received with ostentatious courtesy by the King. Everything flattered his pride and security; there was no sign, no omen of the danger which lowered around him.

Yet Du Molay, if of less generous and unsuspicious nature, should have known the character of Philip, and that every motive which actuated that unscrupulous King was concentrated in its utmost intensity against his Order. Philip's manifest policy was the submission of the whole realm to his despotic power; the elevation of the kingly authority above all feudal check, or ecclesiastical control. Would he endure an armed brotherhood, a brotherhood so completely organized, in itself more formidable than any army he could bring into the field, to occupy a fortress in his capital and other strongholds throughout the kingdom? It was no less his policy to establish an uniform taxation, a heavy and grinding taxation, on all classes, on the Church as on the laity. The Templars had stubbornly refused to pay the tenths which he had levied everywhere else almost without resistance.² There were strong suspi-

¹ Raynouard says, p. 17, " Outre l'immense trésor que l'Ordre conservait dans le palais du Temple à Paris, le chef apporta de l'Orient cent cinquante mille florins d'or, et une grande quantité de gros tournois d'argent, qui formaient la charge de douze chevaux; sommes considérables pour le temps."

² They were exempt by the Papal privilege. These tenths were still in theory permitted by the Pope, as though for holy uses — the recovery of Palestine.

cions that during the strife with the King, Boniface had reckoned on the secret if not active support of the Templars, who, as highly favored by the Pope, had almost always been high Papalists.¹ If they had not held a congregation in defence of Boniface, such congregation might have been held.² For this reason no doubt, if not for a darker one — some concern in the burning of his father — William of Nogaret hated the Templars with all the hatred which he had not exhausted on Pope Boniface.³

Philip knew well not only the strength but the wealth of the Order. He knew their strength, for during the insurrections at Paris on account of the debasement of the coin, he had fled from his own insecure Louvre, and taken refuge in the Temple. From that impregnable fortress he had defied his rebellious subjects, and afterwards having gathered some troops, perhaps with the aid of the Templars themselves, suppressed the mutiny (which the Templars nevertheless were accused of having instigated), and had hanged the insurgents⁴ on the trees around the city. Philip knew too their wealth.⁵ From their treasures alone he had been able

¹ "In diebus suis admirabilis novitas et persecutio facta est super Ordinem Templariorum, quod processit ex invidiâ et cupiditate Philippi Francorum regis, qui odio Templarios habebat, eo quod ausi fuerant stare contra ipsum ex sententiâ excommunicationis, datâ per dictum Bonifacium contra dictum Regem." — *Chronic. Astens. Murator.* xi. p. 193.

² One writer says, "Quia contra Regem congregationem fecerunt."

³ "Gulielmus de Nogaret, Regis Franciæ auctor fuit pro posse ruinæ ordinis Templariorum, eò quod patrem ejus tanquam hæreticum comburi fecerunt." This can hardly be literally true. But see further the striking speech of a Templar going to the stake, and (what cannot be true) the death of Nogaret. — *Chron. Astens. ut supra.*

⁴ Continuator Nangis apud Bouquet, p. 594.

⁵ Of their wealth:

"Li frere, li mestre au Temple
Qu'estoient rempli et ample

to borrow the dowry of his daughter Isabella, on her marriage with Prince Edward of England. Debtors love not their creditors. Du Molay is said to have made importunate and unwelcome demands for repayment.¹ Every race or community possessed of dangerous riches had in turn suffered the extortionate persecutions of Philip. Would his avarice, which had drained the Jews, the Lombards, and laid his sacrilegious hands on the Church, so tempted, respect the Templars, even if he had no excuse of religious zeal or regard for morals to justify his confiscation of their riches?

Du Molay, in his lofty security, proceeded to the great meeting at Poitiers, to pay his allegiance with the Princes and Sovereigns, and to give counsel to the Pope on the affairs of the East and those of the Military Orders. Du Molay's advice as to the future Crusade, however wise and well-grounded, might seem a death-blow to all hopes of success. There could be no reliance on the King of Armenia; to reconquer the Holy Land would demand the league and coöperation of all the Kings of Christendom. Their united forces, conveyed by the united fleets of Genoa, Venice, and other maritime cities, should land at Cyprus; and from Cyprus carry on a regular and aggressive war. The proposal for the

Du Molay at
Poitiers.

D'or, d'argent et de richesse,
Et qui ménoient tel noblesse . . .
Tozjors achetoient sans vendre."

Chronique quoted by Raynouard, p. 7.

According to Paris, "Habent Templarii in Christianitate novem millia manerium." — p. 417.

¹ "Quia is magistrum ordinis exosum habuit, propter importunam pecuniæ exactionem, quam in nuptiis filiæ suæ Isabellæ ei mutuum dederat. Inhiabat præterea prædiis militum et possessionibus." — Thom. de l'Isle, *Edward II.*, quoted in note to Baluzius, Pap. Avionen., p. 589.

fusion of the Knights of the Temple and of St. John, a scheme proposed by Gregory X. and by St. Louis, he coldly rejected as impracticable. "That which is new is not always the best. The Orders, in their separate corporations, had done great things; it was doubtful how, if united, they would act together. Both were spiritual as well as secular institutions: neither could, with safe conscience, give up the statutes to which they had sworn, to adopt those of the other. There would rise inextinguishable discord concerning their estates and possessions. The Templars were lavish of their wealth, the Hospitallers only intent on amassing wealth: on this head there must be endless strife. The Templars were in better fame, more richly endowed by the laity. The Templars would lose their popularity, or excite the envy of the Hospitallers. There would be eternal contests between the heads of the Orders, as to the conferring dignities and offices of trust. The united Order might be more strong and formidable, and yet many ancient establishments fall to the ground; and so the collective wealth and power might be diminished rather than augmented."¹

Yet even now that Du Molay was holding this almost supercilious language, the mine was under his feet, ready to burst and explode. Du Molay could not be absolutely ignorant of the sinister rumors which had long been spread abroad concerning the faith, the morals, the secret mysteries of his Order; he could not be ignorant that they had been repeatedly urged upon the Pope by the King himself, by his counsellors, by the Prior of the new convent in Poitiers.² But he

¹ See the Document in Baluzius, vol. ii. p. 174.

² Letter of Clement to Philip, Baluzius, ii. p. 74. This letter is misdated

maintained, both he and the other Preceptors of the Order, the same haughty demeanor. They demanded again and again, and in the most urgent terms, rigid investigation, so that, if blameless, as they asserted, they might receive public absolution; if guilty, might suffer condemnation.¹ Content with this defiance of their enemies, Du Molay and the other Preceptors returned quietly to Paris.²

There was a certain Squino di Florian, Prior of Montfalcon, in the county of Toulouse, who Squino di Florian. had been condemned, as a heretic and a man of evil life, to perpetual imprisonment in the dungeons of one of the royal castles. There he met one Roffo, a Florentine, an apostate Templar, perhaps some others: he contrived to communicate to the King's officers that he could reveal foul and monstrous secrets of the Order. He was admitted to the royal presence; and on his attestation the vague and terrible charges, which had been floating about as rumors, grew into distinct and awful articles of accusation.³

by Baluzius. Wilcke has retained the error. The letter mentions the death of Edward I., which took place July 7, 1307. It was written when Clement was at or near Poitiers. The king had left the city.

¹ "Quia verò magister militiæ Templi ac multi præceptores, tam de regno tuo quam de aliis, ordinis cum eodem, audito, ut dixerunt, quid tam erga nos te quam erga aliquos alios dominos temporales super prædicto facto eorum opinio gravabatur, a nobis, nedum semel, sed pluries cum magnâ instantiâ petierunt quod nos super illis eis falsò impositis, ut dicebant, vellemus inquirere veritatem, ac eos, si reperirentur, ut asserebant, inculpabiles, absolvere, vel ipsos si reperirentur culpabiles, quod nullatenus credebant, condemnare vellemus." — Ex Epist. ut supra.

² Raynouard, p. 18.

³ Baluzii Vit. vi. Villani, viii. 92. This was the current history of the time. The historian expresses, too, the prevailing opinion out of France. "Ma più si dice, che fu per trarre di loro molta moneta. E per sdegnc preso col maestro del tempio, e colla magione. Il Papa per levarsi del dosso il Re di Francia per la richiesta del condannare Papa Bonifazio . . . per

Christendom heard with amazement and horror that this noble, proud, and austere Order, which ^{Charges} had waged irreconcilable war with the Sara- ^{against the} Order. cens, poured its best blood, like water, for two hundred years on the soil of Palestine, sworn to the severest chastity as to the most rigorous discipline, was charged and publicly charged by the King of France with the most deliberate infidelity, with the most revolting lust, with the most subtle treason to Christendom. The sum of these charges, as appeared from the examinations, was, — that at the secret initiation into the Order, each novice was compelled to deny Christ, and to spit upon the Cross; that obscene kisses were given and received by the candidate; that an idol, the head either of a cat, or with two human faces, or that of one of the eleven thousand virgins, or of some other monstrous form, was the object of their secret worship; that they wore a cord which had acquired a magical or talismanic power by contact with this idol; that full license was granted for the indulgence of unnatural lusts; that parts of the canon of the mass were omitted in their churches; that the Grand Master and other great officers, even when not in holy orders, claimed the power of granting absolution; that they were in secret league with the Mohammedans, and had constantly betrayed the Christian cause, especially that of St. Louis at Mansura. These were the formal legal charges, of which the accusers offered to furnish proof, or to wring confession by torture from the criminals

piacere al Re li assentè di ciò fare." Dupuy observes (*De la Condemnation des Templiers*, p. 8), that *all* the historians of the times agree in this. He refers to them. Compare also Note, p. 193, in Haveman, *Geschichte des Ausgangs des Tempelherren Ordens*. Stuttgart, 1843.

themselves. Popular credulity, terror, hatred, envy, either by the usual inventiveness of common rumor, or by the industrious malice of the King and his counsellors, darkened even these crimes into more appalling and loathsome acts. If a Templar refused to continue to his death in his wickedness, he was burned and his ashes given to be drank by the younger Templars. A child begotten on a virgin was cooked and roasted, and the idol anointed with its fat.¹

Philip did not await the tardy decision of the Pope. Arrest of the Templars. A slower process might have banded together this formidable body, thus driven to despair, in resistance if not in rebellion. On the 14th of September, the Feast of the Elevation of the Cross, sealed instructions were issued to all the seneschals and other high officers of the crown throughout the realm, to summon each a powerful armed force, on the night of the 12th of October: then and not before, under pain of death, to open those close instructions.² The instructions ran, that according to secret counsels taken

¹ See the eleven articles in the *Chronique de Saint Denys*, Bouquet, p. 686. Observe among the more heinous charges is one that they refused to pay taxes to the king. "Que eux reconnurent du Trésor du Roi a aucuns avoir donné, qui au Roi avoient fait, contrariété, laquelle chose étoit moult damageable au Royaume." — Art. vi.

² In Dupuy, i. p. 311. There is a copy of the orders addressed to the Vidame and the Bailiff of Amiens. It is dated Pontisera ("Pontoise"). But the fullest "instructions" are those from the archives of Nismes, published by Menard, "*Histoire de Nismes*," Preuves, p. 195. They begin with these inflaming words: "Res amara, res flebilis, res quidem cogitatu horribilis, auditu terribilis, detestabilis crimine, execrabilis scelere, abominabilis opere, detestanda flagitio, res penitus ymo ab omni humanitate seposita, dudum fide dignorum relacione multorum . . ." Those employed "sai-zare" must be well armed, "in manu forti ne possit per illos fratres et eorum familias resisti." Inquisition was to be made "particulariter et diversim omnimodo quo poterunt, etiam ubi faciendum viderint, *per tormenta*." — p. 197.

with the Holy Father the Pope, with his cognizance if not his sanction, the King gave command to arrest on one and the same day all the Knights Templars within the kingdom ; to commit them to safe custody, and to set the royal seal on all their goods, to make a careful inventory thereof, and to retain them in the name of the King. Philip's officers were trained to execute these rapid and simultaneous movements for the apprehension and spoliation of some devoted class of his subjects. That which had succeeded so well with the defenceless Lombards and Jews, was executed with equal promptitude and precision against the warlike Templars. In one day (Friday, October 13th), at the dawn of one day, with no single act of resistance, with no single attempt at flight, as if not the slightest intimation of measures which had been a month in preparation had reached their ears ; or as if, presuming on their innocence, numbers, or popularity, they had not deigned to take alarm : the whole Order, every one of these high-born and valiant warriors, found the houses of the Order surrounded by the King's soldiers, and was dragged forth to prison. The inventory of the whole property was made, and was in the King's power. In Paris William of Nogaret and Reginald de Roye, fit executioners of such a mandate, were intrusted with the arrest of the Grand Master and the Knights in Paris. Jacques du Molay but the day before had held the pall at the funeral of the King's sister.¹ They were confined in separate dungeons. The royal officers took possession of the strong and stately mansion which had given refuge to the King. Everywhere throughout France there was the same

¹ Poele. Baluz. Vit. I. Michelet, Hist. des Français, vol. iv. ch. iii.

suddenness, the same despatch, the same success. Every Templar in the realm was a prisoner.¹

The secrecy, the celerity, the punctuality with which those orders were executed throughout the realm, could not but excite, even had they been employed on an affair of less moment, amazement and admiration bordering on terror. The Templars were wealthy, powerful, had connections at once among the highest and the humblest families. They had been haughty, insolent, but many at least lavish in almsgiving. They partook of the sanctity which invested all religious bodies; they were or had been the defenders of the Sepulchre of Christ; they had fought, knelt, worshipped in the Holy Land. It was prudent, if not necessary, to crush at once all popular sympathy; to leave no doubt of the King's justice, or suspicion of his motives in seizing such rich and tempting endowments. The very day after the apprehension of the Knights, the Canons of Notre Dame and the Masters of the University of Paris were assembled in the Chapter-house of that church. The Chancellor William of Nogaret, the Provost of Paris, and others of the King's ministers, with William Imbert, the King's confessor and Grand Inquisitor of the realm, to whose jurisdiction the whole affair was committed, made their appearance, and arraigned the Order on five enormous charges.² I. The denial of Christ and the

Further proceedings.

¹ Neither the names nor the numbers of the prisoners in other seneschalties are known. Sixty were arrested at Beaucaire: forty-five of these incarcerated at Aigues Mortes, fifteen at Nîmes. Thirty-three were committed to the royal castle of Alais.

² *Casus enormissimos.* Baluzii Vit. I. The first of these Lives (of Clement V.) was written by John, Canon of St. Victor in Paris, and therefore is the best authority for the events in Paris.

insult to the Cross ; II. The adoration of an idolatrous head ; III. The kisses at their reception ; IV. The omission of the words of consecration in the mass ; V. Unnatural crimes. On the same day (Saturday) the theological faculty of Paris was summoned to give judgment whether the King could proceed against a religious Order on his own authority. They took time for their deliberation : their formal sentence was not promulgated till some months after ; its substance was probably declared or anticipated. A tempo- Preachings. ral judge cannot pass sentence in case of heresy, unless summoned thereto by the Church, and where the heretics have been made over to the secular arm. But in case of necessity he may apprehend and imprison a heretic, with the intent to deliver him over to the Church.¹ The next day (Sunday) the whole clergy and the people from all the parishes of the city were gathered together in the gardens of the royal palace. Sermons were delivered by the most popular preachers, the Friars ; addresses were made to the multitude by the King's ministers, denouncing, blackening, aggravating the crimes of the Templars. No means were spared to allay any possible movement of interest in their favor. Blow followed blow without pause or delay ; every rebellious impulse of sympathy, every feeling of compunction, respect, gratitude, pity, must be crushed by terror out of the hearts of men.² The Grand Inquisitor opened his Court, with the Chancellor, and as many of the King's ministers as were present. The apprehension of the Templars, in order

¹ Crevier, ii. p. 207. Wilcke, i. p. 284.

² " Ne populus scandalizaretur de eorum tam subitaneâ captione. Erant quippe potentissimi divitiis et honore." — Vit. I. p. 9.

to their safe custody, and with the intent to deliver them over to the Church, was assumed, or declared to be within the province of the temporal power. The final judgment was reserved for the Archbishops and Bishops : but the Head of the Inquisition, the Dominican William Imbert, thus lent the terrors of his presence to the King's commission.

The tribunal sat from day to day, endeavoring to extort confession from the one hundred and forty prisoners, who were separately examined. These men, some brave and well-born, but mostly rude and illiterate soldiers, some humble servants of the Order, were brought up from their dungeons without counsel, mutual communication, or legal advice, and submitted to every trial which subtlety or cruelty could invent, or which could work on the feebler or the firmer mind, — shame, terror, pain, the hope of impunity, of reward. Confession was bribed out of some by offers of indulgence, wrung from others by the dread of torture, by actual torture, — torture, with the various ways of which our hearts must be shocked, that we may judge more fairly on their effects. These were among the forms of procedure by torture in those times, without doubt mercilessly employed in the dungeons which confined the Templars. The criminal was stripped, his hands tied behind him ; the cord which lashed his hands hung upon a pulley at some height above. At the sign of the judge he was hauled up with a frightful wrench, and then violently let fall to the ground. This was called in the common phrase, hoisting. It was the most usual, perhaps the mildest form of torture. After that the feet of the criminal were fixed in a kind of stocks, rubbed with oil, and

fire applied to the soles. If he showed a disposition to confess, a board was driven between his feet and the fire; if he gave no further hopes, it was withdrawn again. Then iron boots were fitted to the naked heels, and contracted either by wedges or in some other manner. Splinters of wood were driven up the nails into the finger-joints; teeth were wrenched out; heavy weights hung on the most sensitive parts of the body, even on the genitals. And these excruciating agonies were inflicted by the basest executioners, on proud men, suddenly degraded into criminals, their spirits shattered either by the sudden withdrawal from the light of day, from the pride, pomp, it might be the luxury of life into foul, narrow, sunless dungeons; or more slowly broken by long incarceration in these clammy, noisome holes: some almost starved. The effect upon their minds will appear hereafter from the horror and shuddering agony with which they are reverted to by the bravest Knights. If their hard frames, inured to endurance in adventure and war, might feel less acutely the bodily sufferings, their lofty and generous minds would be more sensitive to the shame and degradation. Knights were racked like the basest slaves; and there was nothing to awaken, everything to repress, the pride of endurance; no publicity, nothing of the stern consolation of defying, or bearing bravely or contemptuously before the eyes of men the cruel agony. It was all secret, all in the depths of the gloomy dungeon, where human sympathy and human admiration could not find their way. And according to the rigor and the secrecy of the torture was the terrible temptation of the weak or fearful, of those whose patience gave way with the first wrench of the rack, to purchase im-

punity by acknowledging whatever the accuser might suggest: to despair of himself, of the Order, whose doom might seem irretrievably, irrevocably sealed. Their very vices (and no doubt many had vices), the unmeasured haughtiness of most, the licentious self-indulgence of some, would aggravate the trial; utter prostration would follow overweening pride, softness, luxury.

Some accordingly admitted at once or slowly, and *confessions*. with bitter tears, a part or the whole of the charges: some as it seemed, touched with repentance, some at the threats, at the sight of the instruments of torture: some not till after long actual suffering: some beguiled by bland promises: some subdued by starvation in prison. Many, however, persevered to the end in calm and steadfast denial, more retracted their confessions, and expired upon the rack.¹ The King himself, by one account, was present at the examination of the Grand Master: the awe of the royal presence wrought some to confession. But Philip withdrew, it should seem, when tortures were actually applied, under which, it is said, in the unintentional irony of the historian, some *willingly* confessed, though others died without confession. To those who confessed the King seemed disposed to hold out the possibility of mercy.²

¹ "Factumque est ut eorum nonnulli sponte quadam præmissorum vel omnia laqueabiliter sunt confessi. Alii quidem, ut videbatur, penitentiam danti, alii autem diversis tormentis questionati, vel comminatione vel eorum aspectu perterriti; alii blandis tracti: præmissionibus et flecti; alii carceris mediâ cruciati vel coacti multipliciternque compulsi. . . . Multi tamen penitus omnia negaverunt, et plures qui confessi prius fuerunt ad negationem postea reversi sunt, in ea fortiter perseverantes, quorum nonnulli inter ipsa supplicia perierunt." — Continuat. Nang's.

² "Maître milite Templeier cum multis militibus, et viris magnis sui Ordinis captus apud Parisios a Rege productus fuisset. Tunc quidam ipsorum propter verecundiam veritatem de præmissis denegaverunt,

After some interval the University of Paris was summoned to the Temple to hear nothing less than the confession of the Grand Master ^{Confession of Grand Master} himself. How Du Molay was wrought to confession, by what persuasion or what violence, remained among the secrets of his dungeon; it is equally uncertain what were the articles which he confessed. Some at this trial asserted that the accursed form of initiation had been unknown in the Order till within the last forty years. But this was not enough; they must be won or compelled to more full acknowledgment. At a second session before the University the Master and the rest pleaded guilty, and in the name of the whole Order, to all the charges.¹ The King's Almoner, the Treasurer of the Temple at Paris, made the same confession. But this confession of the Grand Master, however industriously bruited abroad, in whatever form it might seem fit to the enemies of the Order, though no doubt it had a powerful effect upon the weaker brethren who sought a precedent for their weakness, and with those who might think a cause abandoned by the Grand Master utterly desperate, by no means produced complete submission. Still a great number of the Knights repudiated the base example, disbelieved its authenticity, or excused it, as wrung from him by intolerable tortures; they sternly adhered to their denial. One brave old Knight in the South declared that "if the Grand

et quidam alii ipsam sibi confessi fuerunt. Sed postea illi qui denegabant cum tormentis ipsam tunc *libenter* confitebantur, et aliqui ipsorum in tormentis sine confessione moriebantur, vel comburebantur (the burning was later). Et tunc de confitentibus ultra (ultra?) veritatem ipse initius se habebat." — Vit. VI. apud Baluz. p. 101.

¹ They were not content to admit "quosdam articulorum." "Item in aliâ congregatione coram Universitate Magister et alii plures simpliciter sunt confessi, et Magister pro toto Ordine." — Vit. I. p. 19.

Master had uttered such things, he had lied in his throat."

The interrogatory had done its work. The prisoners were carried back to their dungeons, some in the Temple, some in the Louvre, and in other prisons. The Grand Master with the three Preceptors of the Order were transferred to the royal castle of Corbeil; the Treasurers to Moret. In these prisons many died of hunger, of remorse, and anguish of mind; some hung themselves in despair.¹

With no less awful despatch proceeded the interrogatories in other parts of France. Everywhere torture was prodigally used; everywhere was the same result, some free confessions, some retractations of confessions; some bold and inflexible denials of the whole; some equivocations, some submissions manifestly racked out of unwilling witnesses by imprisonment, exhaustion, and agony.

The Grand Inquisitor proceeded on a circuit to Bayeux: in the other northern cities he delegated his work usually to Dominican Friars. Thirteen were examined at Caen, seven of them had been previously interrogated at Pont de l'Arche. Twelve made confession after torture, on the promise of absolution from the Church, and security against secular punishment. Ten others were examined at Pont de l'Arche. In the south, of seven at Cahors, two recanted their confession. At Clermont twenty-nine obstinately denied the charges, forty admitted their truth. Two German Templars, returning from Paris, were arrested at Chaumont, in Lorraine;

Interrogatories in the Provinces.
Oct. 28, 1307.

¹ "Ubi fama referebat, plures mortuos fuisse inediâ, vel cordis tristitiâ vel ex desperatione suspensio periisse." — Vit. I.

they steadfastly denied the whole. In the seneschalty of Beaucaire and Nismes¹ sixty-six Templars had been arrested by Edward de Maubrisson and William de St. Just, the Lieutenant of the Seneschal, Bertrand Jourdain de l'Isle. They had been committed to different prisons. Edward de Maubrisson held his first sitting at Aigues Mortes upon forty-five who were in the dungeons of that city. The King's Advocate, the King's Justice, and two other nobles were present, but no ecclesiastic either during this or any of the subsequent sessions. According to the precise instructions the following questions were put to the criminals, but cautiously and carefully,² and at first only in general terms, in order to elicit free confession. Where it was necessary torture was to be applied. I. That on the reception the postulant was led into a sacristy behind the altar, commanded thrice to deny Christ, and to spit on the crucifix. Then, II. When he was unclothed, the Initiator kissed him on the navel, the spine, and the mouth. III. He was granted full license for the indulgence of unnatural lusts. IV. Girt with a cord which had been drawn across the idol-head. In the provincial chapters an idol, a human head, was worshipped. V. The clerical brethren were alone to be pressed on the omission of the words in the mass.

Eight servitors were first introduced. They confessed the whole of the first charges; they Nov. 8. 1307. declared that they had denied Christ in fear of imprisonment, even of death; but they had denied him with

¹ In this seneschalty lay the great estate of William of Nogaret. There are several royal grants in the documents at the end of Ménard, *Histoire de Nismes*, vol. i., which show that Nogaret was not sparingly rewarded, even by his parsimonious king, for his services.

² "Caute et diligenter."

the lips, not the heart; they swore that they had never committed unnatural crimes; of the idol and the omission of the words in the mass they knew nothing. On the following day thirty-five more were examined, all servitors except one clerk and three Knights, Pons Seguin, Bertrand de Silva, Bertrand de Salgues. The same confession, word for word, the same reservation: the priest alone acknowledged that he had administered an unconsecrated Host, omitting the words of consecration; but in his heart he had never neglected to utter them. There is throughout the same determination to limit the confession to the narrowest bounds, to keep to the words of the charges, absolutely to exculpate themselves, and to criminate the Order, from which some might rejoice to be released, others think irrevocably doomed. They were all afterwards summoned, in the presence of two monks in the Dominican cloister at Nismes, to whom the Grand Inquisitor had given power to act for the Holy Office, to repeat their confession, and admonished within eight days still further to confess any heresies of which they might have been guilty. Maubrisson also passed to Nismes; fifteen servitors were interrogated; there were the same confessions, the same denials. At Carcassonne the Preceptor of the wealthy house of Villedieu, Cassaignes, with four others, were examined before the Bishop, Peter de Rochefort: they admitted all, even the idol.¹

The Pope was no less astounded than the rest of Christendom by this sudden and rapid measure, so opposite to the tardy and formal pro-

Conduct of
the Pope.

¹ The report, the fullest and most minute of all, as to the interrogatories at Nismes, is dated 1310. But it contains the earlier proceedings from the beginning of the prosecution out of the Authentic Acts. I have therefore dwelt upon it more at length. — Ménard, *Hist. de Nismes*, p. 449; *Preuves*, p. 195.

cedures of the Roman Court. It was a flagrant and insulting invasion of the Papal rights, the arrest of a whole religious Order, under the special and peculiar protection of the Pope, and the seizure of all their estates and goods, so far as yet appeared, for the royal use. It looked at first like a studied exclusion of all spiritual persons even from the interrogatory. Clement could not suppress his indignation: he broke out into angry expressions against the ^{Poitiers.} King; he issued a Bull, in which he declared it an un-^{Oct. 27.}heard-of measure that the secular power should presume to judge religious persons; to the Pope alone belonged the jurisdiction over the Knights Templars. He deposed William Imbert from the office of Grand Inquisitor, as having presumptuously overstepped his powers. He sent two Legates, the Cardinal Berenger of Fredeol and Stephen of Suza, to demand the surrender of the prisoners and of their estates to the Pope. In a letter to the Archbishops of Rheims, Bourges and Tours, he declared that he had been utterly amazed at the arrest of the Templars, and the hasty proceedings of the Grand Inquisitor, who, though he lived in his immediate neighborhood, had given him no intimation of the King's design. He had his own views on the subject; his mind could not be induced to believe the charges.¹

But, when the first impulse of his wrath was over, the Pope felt his own impotence; he was in the toils, in the power, now imprudently within the dominions, of the relentless Philip; his resentment speedily cooled down. The great prelates of France arrayed themselves on the side of the King. The King held secret

¹ Dachery, *Spicilegium*, x. 366.

councils at Melun, and at other places, with the Princes and Bishops of the realm, meditating, it might be, strong measures against the Pope. Somewhat later, the Archbishop of Rheims announced to the King that himself, with his Suffragans and Chapter, had met at Senlis, and were prepared to aid the King in his prosecution of the Templars.¹

The King of France had laid down a wide scheme for the suppression of the Templars, not in his own dominions alone, but throughout Christendom. Abolished on account of their presumed irregularities in France, they could not be permitted, as involved in the same guilt, to subsist in the English dominions in France, in Provence, or even in England. Already, on the issuing the instructions for their arrest, Philip had
Message to England. despatched an ecclesiastic, Bernard Pelet, to his son-in-law, Edward II. of England, to inform him of their guilt and heresy, and to urge him to take the same measures for their apprehension. Edward and his Barons declared themselves utterly amazed at the demand.² Neither he nor his Prelates and Barons could at first credit the abominable and execrable charges; but before the end of the year, the Pope himself, as if unwilling that Edward, as Philip had done, should take the affair into his own hands and proceed without Papal authority, hastened to issue a Bull, in which he commanded the King to arrest all the Templars in his dominions, and to sequester their lands and property. The Bull, however, seemed studiously

¹ "Ad vestram presenciam duximus destinandum (episcopum) ad assentiendum secundum Deum et justitiam vestræ majestati." — Archives Administrat. de Rheims, Collect. Documents Inédits, ii. 65.

² 22d Sept., Edwardus Philippo. — Rymer, iii. ad ann. 1307.

to limit the guilt to individual members of the Order.¹ The goods were to be retained for the service of the Holy Land, if the Order should be condemned, otherwise to be preserved for the Order. It referred to the confession of the Grand Master at Paris, that this abuse had crept in at the instigation of Satan, contrary to the Institutes of the Order. The Pope declares that one brother of the Order, a man of high birth and rank, had made full confession to himself of his crime; that in the kingdom of Cyprus a noble knight had made his abnegation of Christ at the command of the Grand Master in the presence of a hundred knights.

King Edward had hesitated. On the 4th December, as though under the influence of the Templars themselves, he wrote to the Kings of Portugal, Castile, Sicily, and Arragon. He expressed strong suspicion of Bernard Pelet, who had presumed to make some horrid and detestable accusations against the Order, and endeavored by letters of certain persons, which he had produced (those of the King of France), but had procured, as Edward believed, by undue means, to induce the King to imprison all the brethren of the Temple in his dominions. He urged those Kings to avert their ears from the calumniators of the Order, to join him in protecting the Knights from the avarice and jealousy of their enemies.² Still later, King Edward, in a letter to the Pope, asserts the pure faith and lofty morals of the Order, and speaks of the detractions

¹ "Quod *singuli* fratres dicti ordinis in sua professione . . . expressis verbis abnegant Jes. Christum. . . ." See the Bull, "Pastoralis præeminentiæ solio." — Raynaldus sub ann. Nov. 22, Rymer.

² "Aures vestras a perversorum detractionibus, qui, ut credimus, non zelo rectitudinis sed cupiditatis et invidiæ spiritibus excitantur, avertere velitis." — Redyng. Dec. 4, Rymer sub ann.

and calumnies of a few persons jealous of their greatness, and convicted of ill-will to the Order.¹

The Papal Bull either appalled or convinced the
Arrest. King of England. Only five days after his letter (the Bull having arrived in the interim), orders were issued to the sheriffs for the general arrest of the Templars throughout England. The persons of the knights were to be treated with respect, the inventory of their names and effects returned into the Exchequer
Dec. 20. at Westminster. The same instructions were sent to Wales, Ireland, and Scotland. On the 28th December the King informed the Pope that he would speedily carry his commands into execution. On the Wednesday after Epiphany the arrest took place with the same simultaneous promptitude as in France, and without resistance.

The King of Naples, as Count of Provence, followed
King of Naples. exactly the plan of the King of France. He transmitted sealed instructions to all the officers of the Crown, which were to be opened on the 24th January. On the 25th all the Templars in Provence and Forcalquier were committed to the prisons of Aix and Pertuis; those of the counties of Nice, Grafe, St. Maurice, and the houses in Avignon and Arles, to the Castle of Meirargues.

Just at this juncture an appalling event took place,
Death of the Emperor. which in some degree distracted the attention of Christendom from the rapidly unfolding tragedy of the Templars, and had perhaps no inconsiderable though remote influence on their doom. The Emperor Albert was murdered at Königstein by his own nephew, John, in the full view of their ancestral

¹ Rymer, Dec. 10.

house.¹ The King of France was known to aspire to the imperial crown, if not for himself, for his brother Charles of Valois. He instantly despatched ^{Charles of Valois seeks the Empire.} ambassadors to secure the support of the Pope for Charles of Valois — Charles, the old enemy of Clement, to whom he had been reconciled only on compulsion. It is even asserted that he demanded this as the last, the secret stipulation, sworn to by the Pope when he sold himself to the King for the tiara.² But the accumulation of crowns on the heads of the princes of France was not more formidable to the liberties of Europe than to the Pope, who must inevitably sink even into more ignoble vassalage. A Valois ruled in France and in Naples. A daughter of the King of

¹ Coxe has told coldly the terrible vengeance of the Empress Agnes. She witnessed the execution of sixty-three of the retainers of the Lord of Balm, the accomplice of John of Hapsburg. "Now," she said, as the blood flowed, "I bathe in honey dew." She founded the magnificent convent of Königstein, of which fine ruins remain. Christianity still finds a voice in the wildest and worst times. The rebuke of the hermit to the vengeful Empress must be heard: "God is not served by shedding innocent blood, and by building convents from the plunder of families, but by confession and forgiveness of injuries." — Compare Coxe's *Austria*, ch. vi.

² "Rex autem Franciæ Philippus, auditâ vacatione imperii, cogitavit facile posse imperium redire ad Francos, ratione sextæ promissionis factæ sibi a Papâ, si operam daret ut papa crearetur, sicut factum est. Nam cum explicasset jam eam, videlicet in delendo quicquid gestum fuit per Bonifacium et memoriam ejus, ad quod Papa se difficultabat, et in posterum hoc offerebat agendum, arbitratus est Rex commutari facere quod fuerat postulatum ab eo in sibi utilius et honorabilius negotium, ut videlicet loco prædictæ petitionis hoc concederetur, ut Dominus Carolus Valisiensis, frater ejus eligeretur in Imperatorem. Quod satis æquum et exigibile videbatur, cum Bonifacius Papa hoc ei promississet, et ad hoc multa fecerat pro ecclesiâ. Sed et olim imperium fuerat apud Francos tempore Caroli magni, translatus a Græcis ad eos, sic possit transire de Teutonicis ad Francos." — S. Antonini *Chronicon*, iii. p. 276. This Chronicle is a compilation in the words of other writers, but shows what writers were held in best esteem, when the Archbishop of Florence (afterwards canonized) wrote during the next century.

France was on the throne of England: it might be hoped, or foreseen, that the young, beautiful, and ambitious bride might wean her feeble husband from the disgraceful thralldom of his minions, and govern him who could not govern himself. If Charles were Emperor, what power in Europe could then resist or control this omnipotent house of Valois?

Philip had already bought the vote and support of the Archbishop of Cologne; he anticipated the tame acquiescence of the Pope. Charles of Valois visited the Pope with the ostentation of respect, but at the head of six thousand men-at-arms.

But the sagacious Cardinal da Prato was at hand to keep alive the fears and to guide the actions of Clement. The Pope had no resource but profound dissimulation, or rather consummate falsehood. He wrote publicly to recommend Charles of Valois to the electors; his secret agents urged them to secure their own liberties and the independence of the Church by any other choice.¹ The election dragged on for some months of doubt, vacillation, and intrigue. At length Henry of Luxemburg was named King of the Romans.² Clement pretended to submit to the hard necessity of consenting to a choice in which six of the electors had concurred; he could no longer in decency assert the claims of Charles of Valois. Philip suppressed but did not the less brood over his disappointment and wrath.

Thus all this time, if Clement had any lingering

¹ "Sed omnipotens Deus (writes S. Antoninus) qui dissipat consilia principum . . . non permisit rem ipsam suum habere effectum, ne ecclesia regno Franciæ subjiceretur." — Ibid.

² At Frankfort, Nov. 27, 1308.

desire to show favor or justice to the Templars, or to maintain the Order, it had sunk into an object not only secondary to that which he thought his paramount duty and the chief interest of the Papacy, to avert the condemnation from the memory of Boniface; but also to that of rescuing the imperial crown from the grasp of France. To contest a third, a more doubtful issue with King Philip, was in his situation, and with his pliant character, with his fatal engagements, and his want of vigor and moral dignity, beyond his powers.

The King neglected no means to overawe the Pope. He had succeeded in making his quarrel with Pope Boniface a national question. For the ^{Parliament of Tours.} first time the Commons of France had been summoned formally and distinctly to the Parliament, which had given weight and dignity to the King's proceedings against Pope Boniface.¹ The States-General, the burghers and citizens, as well as the nobles and prelates, the whole French nation, were now again summoned to a Parliament at Tours on May 1. Philip knew that by this time he had penetrated the whole realm with his hatred of the Templars. The Order had been long odious to the clergy, as interfering with their proceedings, and exercising spiritual functions at least within their own precincts. The Knights sat proudly aloof in their own fastnesses, and despised the jurisdiction of the Bishop or the Metropolitan. The excommunication, the interdict, which smote or silenced the clergy, had no effect within the walls of the Temple. Their bells tolled, their masses were chanted, when all the rest of the kingdom was in silence and

¹ See above, page 318.

sorrow ; men fled to them to find the consolations forbidden elsewhere. Their ample and growing estates refused to pay tithe to the clergy ; their exemption rested on Papal authority. It was one of the charges which in enormity seemed to be not less hateful than the most awful blasphemy or the foulest indulgences, that the great officers, the Grand Master, though not in orders, dared to pronounce the absolution. The Nobles were jealous of a privileged Order, and no doubt with the commonalty looked to some lightening of their own burdens from the confiscation, to which they would willingly give their suffrage, of the estates of the Templars ; nor did these proud feudal lords like men prouder than themselves.¹ Among the commonalty the dark rumors so industriously disseminated, the reports of full and revolting confessions, had now been long working ; the popular mind was fully possessed with horror at these impious, execrable practices. At particular periods, free institutions are the most ready and obsequious instruments of tyranny : the popular Parliament of Philip the Fair sanctioned, by their acclamation, his worst iniquities ;² and the politic Philip, before this appeal to the people, knew well to what effect the popular voice would speak. The Parliament of Tours, with hardly a dissentient vote, declared the Templars worthy of death.³ The University of Paris gave the weight of their judgment as to the fulness and authenticity of the confessions ; at the same time they

¹ Eight of the nobility of Languedoc, at the Parliament of Tours, intrusted their powers to William of Nogaret. — Hist. de Languedoc, iv. 146.

² "Intendebat enim Rex sapienter agere. Et ideo volebat hominem cujuslibet conditionis regni sui habere judicium vel assensum, ne possit in aliquo reprehendi." — Vit. i. p. 12.

³ Vit. i. *ibid.*

reasserted the sole right of the Roman Court to pass the final sentence.

From Tours, the King, with his sons, brothers, and chief counsellors, proceeded at Whitsuntide to the Pope at Poitiers. He came armed with the Acts of the General Estates of the realm. They were laid before the Pope by William de Plasian. The Pope was summoned to proceed against the Order for confessed and notorious heresy.

This appeal to his tribunal seemed to awaken Clement to the consciousness of his strength. For the temporal power to assume the right, even now when the Pope was in the King's realm, of adjudging in causes of heresy, was too flagrant an invasion on the spiritual power. The fate of the Order too must depend on the Pope. The King might seize, imprison, interrogate, even put to the torture, individual Templars, his subjects; but the dissolution of the Order, founded under the Papal sanction, guaranteed by so many Papal Bulls, could not be commanded by any other authority. Clement intrenched himself behind the yet lingering awe, the yet unquestioned dignity of the Papal See. "The charges were heavy, but they had been pressed on with indecent haste, without consulting the successor of St. Peter; the Grand Inquisitor had exceeded his powers; the Pope demanded that all the prisoners should be made over to himself, the sole judge in such high matters." Long and sullen discussions took place between the Cardinals and the Counsellors of the King.¹

¹ "Fuitque ibi pretactum negotium factis, allegationibus et rationibus, pro parte Papæ et responsionibus pro Rege, rationibusque et replicationibus multis utrinque coram cardinalibus cleroque et cæteris qui aderant *morosè* discussum." — Vit. i.

The King (the affair of the Empire was not settled, that was the secret of Clement's power) was unwilling to drive the Pope to extremities. He ordered copies of all the proceedings against the Knights, and the inventories of their goods, to be furnished to the Pontiff. This Clement took in good part. The custody of the estates and property of the Order had given a perilous advantage to the King. The Pope now issued a circular Bull to the Archbishops and Bishops of France to take upon themselves the administration of all the sequestered goods; and to them was to be consigned, to each within his own diocese, the final examination and judgment.¹ The Templars caught at the faint gleam of hope that the Church would assume the judgment; they were fondly possessed with a notion of the justice, the humanity of the Church. Some instantly recanted their confessions. The King broke out into a passion of wrath. He publicly proclaimed, that while he faithfully discharged the duties of a Christian king and a servant of the Lord, the lukewarm Vicegerent of Christ was tampering with heresy, and must answer before God for his guilt. The Pope took alarm. At length it was agreed that the custody both of the persons and the goods should remain with the King; that the Knights should be maintained in prison, where they were to lie, out of the revenues of their estates; that no personal punishment should be inflicted without the consent of the Pope; that the fate of the Order should be determined at the great Council of Vienne, summoned for October 10, 1310.² Clement reserved for

¹ Clemens Philippo. — Baluz. ii. 98. The date is erroneous; it should be July 3, 1308.

² " Tandem conventum est inter eos, quod Rex bona eorum omnia leva-

himself the sentence on the Grand Master and other chief officers of the Temple.

Yet before Philip left Poitiers, seventy-two Templars were brought from different prisons (with the King and the King's Counsellors rested the selection): they were interrogated before the Pope and the Cardinals. All confessed the whole: they were remanded. In a few days after, their confessions were read to them in the vulgar tongue, in the Consistory; all adhered to their truth.

But the Grand Master and some of the principal preceptors of the Order — those of Normandy, Aquitaine, and Poitou — were now in confinement in the castle of Chinon. Some of them could not mount on horseback, some were so weak that they could not be conveyed to Poitiers:¹ the torture and the dungeon had done their work. Three Cardinals (Berenger of St. Nireus and Achilles, Stephen of St. Cyriac, Landolph of St. Angelo) were commissioned to go and receive their depositions. The Cardinals reported that all those Knights, in the presence of public notaries and other good men, had sworn on the Gospels, without compulsion or fear, to the denial of Christ, and the insult to the cross on initiation; some others to foul and horrible offences, not to be named. Du Molay had confessed the denial; he had empowered a servitor of

ret, seu levare faceret fideliter per ministros, et servare ea usquequo Papa cum ipso Rege diliberasset quid regi expediret, sed punitionem corporum non faceret; corpora tamen eorum servari faceret, sicut fecerat, et de proventibus domorum Templi sustentari usque ad concilium generale futurum: corpora autem ex tunc ponebat Papa in manu suâ." This left, as we shall see, all future public trial to the Church. — Vit. i. p. 13.

¹ "Sed quoniam quidam ex eis sic infirmabantur tunc temporis, quod equitare non poterant, nec ad nostram presenciam quoquomodo adduci." — The Pope's own words in the Bull, "*faciens misericordiam*"!'

the order to make the rest of his confession.¹ The Cardinals, having regard to their penitence, had pronounced the absolution of the Church, and recommended them to the royal mercy.²

The Pope pretended that conviction had been forced upon him by these dreadful revelations. He now issued a Bull, addressed to all Christendom, in which he declared how slowly and with difficulty he had been compelled to believe the infamy, the apostasy of the noble and valiant Order. His beloved son, the King of France, not urged by avarice,³ for he had not intended to confiscate or appropriate to his own use the goods of the Templars (he that excuses sometimes accuses!) but actuated solely by zeal for the faith, had laid information before him which he could not but receive. One Knight of noble race, and of no light esteem (could this be Squino de Florian, the Prior of Montfalcon?), had deposed in secret, and upon his oath, to these things. It had now been confirmed by seventy-two, who had confessed the guilt of the Order to him; the Grand Master and the others to the Cardinals. Throughout the world therefore, he commanded, by this Apostolic Bull, that proceedings should be instituted against the Knights of the Temple, against the Preceptor of the Order in Germany. The result was to be transmitted, under seal, to the Pope. The secular arm might be called in to compel witnesses who

¹ See below.

² *Epistol. Cardinalium.* — Baluz. ii. 121.

³ Is it charity in the Pope to exculpate the King of avarice? "*Non gippo avaritiæ, cum de bonis Templariorum nihil sibi vindicare vel appropriare intendat,*" or adroitness to clench his concession? See the secret compact about the custody of the goods. — Dupuy, *Condemnation*, p. 107.

were contemptuous of Church censures to bear their testimony.¹

Pope Clement, when this conference was over, hastened to leave his honorable imprisonment at Poitiers. He passed some months at Bordeaux, the Cardinals in the neighborhood. After the winter he retired to Avignon, hereafter to be the residence of the Transalpine Popes.² As he passed through Toulouse he addressed a circular letter to the King of France, in which, having declared the unanswerable evidence of the heresy and the guilt of the Templars, he prohibited all men from aiding, counselling, or favoring, from harboring or concealing, any member of the proscribed Order; he commanded all persons to seize, arrest, and commit them to safe custody. All this under the pain of severe spiritual censure. Yet there were many who stole away unperceived; and for concealment or from want submitted to the humblest functions of society, to plebeian services or illiberal arts. Many bore exile, degradation, indigence, with noble magnanimity — all asserting, wherever it was safe to assert it, as in the Ghibelline cities of Lombardy, the entire and irreproachable innocence of the Order.³

¹ The Bull, "*faciens misericordiam*," dated Aug. 12, 1308.

² Baluz. ii. p. 134. He was at Narbonne, April 5, 1309, then at Montpellier and Nismes; he arrived at Avignon at the end of April. — Ménard, p. 456.

³ "*Si qui autem ex Templariorum cœtu manumissi aut per fugam abstracti evadere potuerunt, projecto Religionis suæ habitu ministeriis plebeiis ignoti, aut artibus illiberalibus se dederunt. Nonnulli autem ex clarissimis parentibus orti, dum transfugæ laboribus multis et periculis dudum expositi, vitæ tædium, magnificis animorum nobilium conatibus vilipenderunt, ultro se gentibus edidere, adjurantes se objecti criminis prorsus insones.*" Ferretus of Vicenza had before said (and in Lombardy the refugees would not fear to describe their sufferings) that many had died in prison, "*tam diu vinculis retentos pædoris squallorisque rigidi angustia peremit.*" — Apud Murator. R. I. S. ix. p. 1017.

As he passed through Nismes, the Pope issued his commission to Bertrand, Bishop of that city, to reinvestigate the guilt of the prisoners. Bertrand held one session; then, on account of his age and infirmity, devolved the office on William St. Lawrence Curé of Durfort. Durfort opened his court first at Nismes, afterwards at Alais. Thirty-two, a few Knights, others servitors, the same who had confessed before the royal commissioners — now that the milder and more impartial Church sat in judgment — now that their chains were struck off, and they felt their limbs free, and hoped that they should not return to their fetid prisons — almost with one voice disclaimed their confessions. One only, manifestly in a paroxysm of fright, and in the eager desire of obtaining absolution, recanted his recantation. Another, Drohet, had abandoned the Order: he confessed, but only from hearsay, and entreated not to be sent back to prison among men whose heresy he detested. A third appeared to the Court to have concerted his evidence, was remanded, made amends by a more ample confession, clearly from panic: he had heard of the cat-idol. The rest firmly, resolutely denied all.¹

¹ The examination at Alais began June 19, 1310, ended July 14. St. Lawrence took as his assessors two canons of Nismes, three Dominicans, two Franciscans of Alais (Ménard, p. 260). Eight were brought from Nismes (of these were three knights), seventeen from Aigues Mortes, seven from the prisons in Alais. It should be added that the recanting witness, Bernard Arnold, swore that the prisoners had met to concert — when? and where? — “*quod cotidie tenebant sua colloquia et suos tractatus super hiis; et sese ad invicem instruunt qualiter negent omnia, et dicant dictum ordinem bonum esse et sanctum.*” — Preuves, p. 175.

CHAPTER II.

PROCESS OF THE TEMPLARS.

THE affair of the Templars slumbered for some months, but it slumbered to awaken into terrible activity. A Papal Commission¹ was now opened to inquire, not into the guilt of the several members of the Order, but of the Order itself. The Order was to be arraigned before the Council of Vienne, which was to decide on its reorganization or its dissolution. This commission therefore superseded all the ordinary jurisdictions either of the Bishop or of the Inquisition, and, in order to furnish irrefragable proof before the Council, summoned before it for reëxamination all who had before made depositions in those Courts. Their confessions were put in as evidence, but they had the opportunity of recanting or disclaiming those confessions.²

At the head of the Commission was Gilles d'Aiscelin, Archbishop of Narbonne, a man of learning, but no strength of character; the Bishop of Mende, who owed his advancement to King Philip; the Bishops of Bayeux and Limoges; the Archdeacons of Rouen (the Papal Notary), of Trent, and Maguelonne, and the Provost of Aix. The Provost excused himself from attendance. The Archbishop and the Bishop of Bay-

¹ Aug. 1309. The Commission sat, with some intermission, to May, 1311.

² See Haveman, p. 227.

eux grew weary and withdrew themselves gradually, on various pretexts, from the sittings.

The Commission opened its Court in the Bishop's palace at Paris¹ August 7th, 1309. The Bull issued by the Pope at Poitiers was read.² Then, after other documents, a citation of the Order of Knights Templars, and all and every one of the Brethren of the said Order. This citation was addressed to the Archbishops of the nine Provinces, Sens, Rheims, Rouen, Tours, Lyons, Bourges, Bordeaux, Narbonne, and Auch, and to their suffragans. It was to be suspended on the doors of all cathedral and collegiate churches, public schools, and court-houses, the houses of the Templars, and the prisons where the Templars were confined. Sworn messengers were despatched to promulgate this citation in the provinces and dioceses. The Templars were to appear on the day after the Feast of St. Martin.

On that day not a Templar was seen. Whether the
 Nov. 12. Bishops were reluctant to give orders, or the
 Commission at Paris. keepers of the prisons to obey orders; whether
 No Templars appear. no means of transport had been provided, no
 one knew; or, what is far less likely, that the
 Templars themselves shrunk from this new interrogatory, hardly hoping that it would be conducted with more mildness, or dreading that it might command

¹The acts of this Commission are the most full, authentic, and curious documents in the history of the abolition of the Templars. They were published imperfectly, or rather a summary of them, by Moldenhauer, Hamburg, 1792. The complete and genuine proceedings have now appeared in the original Latin, among the 'Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France,' under the care of M. Michelet. The second volume has recently been added. My citations, if not otherwise distinguished, refer to these volumes.

² "Faciens misericordiam."

fresh tortures. On five successive days proclamation was made by the apparitor of the Official of Paris, summoning the Knights to answer for their Order. No voice replied. On the Tuesday inquiry was made into the answers of the Bishops to the Court. Some were found to have published the citation, others to have neglected or disobeyed; from some had come no answers; to them letters were addressed of mild rebuke or exhortation. The Templars were to be informed that the investigation was not against individual members of the Order, but against the Order itself. No one was to be compelled to appear; but all who voluntarily undertook the defence of the Order had free liberty to go to Paris.¹

On the 22d of November the Bishop of Paris appeared in Court. He declared that he had himself gone to the prison in which the Grand Master, Hugo de Peyraud the Visitor of the Order, and other Knights were confined; that he had caused the Apostolic letter to be read in Latin, and explained in the vulgar tongue; that the Knights had declared themselves ready to appear before the Court; some were willing to defend the Order. He had published the citation in the churches and other public places, and sent persons of trust to make known and to explain the citation to all the prisoners in the city and diocese of Paris. Orders were issued to Philip de Voher, Provost of the Church of Poitiers, and John de Jamville, door-keeper to the King, who

¹ "Nec volumus quod contra fratres singulares dicti ordinis, et de hiis quæ ipsos tamquam singulares personas tangant, non intendimus inquirere contra eos, sed duntaxat contra ordinem supradictum juxta traditam nobis formam. Nec fuit nostræ intencionis, nec est, quod aliqui ex eis venire cogantur vel teneantur, sed solum ii qui voluntarie venire valeant pro premissis." — p. 25.

had the general custody of the prisoners, to bring before the Court, under a strong and trusty guard, the Master, the Visitor, and all who would undertake the defence. The Provost and De Jamville bowed and promised to obey. On the same day appeared a man in a secular habit, who called himself John de Melot, of the diocese of Besançon. He was manifestly a simple and bewildered man, who had left the Order or who had been dismissed ten years before, and seemed under the influence of panic. "He knew no harm of the Order, did not come to defend it, was ready to do or to suffer whatever the Court might ordain; he prayed that they would furnish him with subsistence, for he was very poor." The Court saw that he was half-witted, and sent him to the Bishop of Paris to be taken care of.¹ Six Knights then stood before the Court. Gerald de Caus was asked why he appeared. He replied, in obedience to the citation: he was prepared to answer any interrogatory. The Court answered, that they compelled no one to come before them, and asked whether he was ready to defend the Order. After many words he said that he was a simple soldier, without house, arms, or land: he had neither ability nor knowledge to defend the Order. So said the other five. Then appeared Hugo de Peyraud, Visitor of the Order, under the custody of the Provost of Poitiers and John de Jamville. He came in consequence of the citation, made

Hugh de
Peyraud.

¹ "Et quia fuit visum eisdem dominis commissariis, ex aspectu et consideratione personæ suæ, actuum, gestuum, et loquelæ, quod erat valde simplex vel fatuus, et non bene compos mentis suæ, non processerunt ulterius cum eodem." — p. 27. By some strange mistake of his own or of his authorities, Sismondi has attributed the speech and conduct of this poor crazy man to Du Molay.

known by the Bishop of Paris, to answer any interrogatory. He came further to entreat the Pope and the King not to waste and dissipate the goods of the Temple, but religiously to devote them to their original use, the cause of the Holy Land. He had given his answers to the three Cardinals at Chinon, had been prepared to do the same before the Pope; he could only say the same before the Commissioners. He too declined to undertake the defence, and was remanded to prison.¹

After two days' adjournment, on Wednesday, November 26th, Du Molay, at his own request, Du Molay. was brought before the Court. He was asked whether he would defend the Order. "The Order was founded," he replied, "and endowed with its privileges by the Pope. He wondered that the Pope would proceed in such haste to the abolition of such an Order. The sentence hung over Frederick II. for thirty-two years. Himself was an unlearned man, unfit, without counsel, to defend the Temple; yet he was prepared to do it to the best of his ability. He should hold himself a base wretch, he would be justly held as a base wretch by others, if he defended not an Order from which he had received so much honor and advantage. Yet this was a hard task for one who had been thrown into prison by the King and by the Pope, and had but four deniers in the world to fee counsel. All he sought was that the

¹ The Court received private information that certain Templars had arrived in Paris, disguised in secular habits, and furnished with money to provide counsel and legal aid to defend the Order; they had been arrested by the king's officers; the Provost of the Châtelet was commanded to bring them before the Court. It was a false alarm. One of them only had been a servitor for those monks; he was poor, and had come to Paris to seek a livelihood. They were gravely informed that if they designed to defend the Order, the Court was ready to hear them: they disclaimed such intention.

truth might be known concerning the Order, not in France only, but before the kings, princes, prelates, and barons of the world. By the judgment of those kings, princes, prelates, and barons he would stand." The Court replied that he should deliberate well on his defence. The Master said, "he had but one attendant, a poor servitor of the Order: he was his cook." They reminded him significantly of his confessions: they would have him to know that, in a case of heresy or faith, the course was direct and summary, without the noise and form of advocates and judicial procedure.

They then, without delay, read the Apostolic letters, and the confession which Du Molay was reported to have made before the three Cardinals. The Grand Master stood aghast; the gallant knight, the devout Christian, rose within him. Twice he signed himself with the sign of the cross. "If the Lords Commissioners were of other condition, he would answer them in another way." The Commissioners coldly replied "that they sat not there to accept wager of battle." Du Molay saw at once his error. "I meant not that, but would to God that the law observed by the Saracens and the Tartars, as to the forgers of false documents, were in use here! The Saracens and Tartars strike off the heads of such traitors, and cleave them to the middle." The Court only subjoined, "The Church passes sentence on heretics, and delivers over the obstinate to the secular arm."

William de Plasian, the subtlest of Philip's counselors, was at hand. He led Du Molay aside: he protested that he loved him as a brother-soldier; he besought him with many words not to rush upon his ruin. Du Molay, confused, perplexed, feared that if

he acted further without thought he might fall into some snare. He requested delay. He felt confidence (fatal confidence!) in De Plasian, for De Plasian was a knight!

The day after, Ponsard de Gisi, Preceptor of Payens, was brought up with Raoul de Gisi, Preceptor Nov. 27. of Lagny Sec. Ponsard boldly declared himself ready to undertake the defence of the Order. All the enormous charges against the Order were utterly, absolutely false; false were all the confessions, extorted by terror and pain, from himself and other brethren before the Bishop of Paris. Those tortures had been applied by the sworn and deadly enemies and accusers of the Order, by the Prior of Montfalcon, and William Roberts, the monk.¹ He put in a schedule:—"These are the traitors who have falsely and disloyally accused the religion of the Temple: William Roberts the monk, who had them put to the torture; Esquin de Florian of Beziers, Prior of Montfalcon; Bernard Pelet, Prior of Maso) Philip's Envoy to England); and Gervais Boysol, Knight of Gisors."²

Had Ponsard himself been tortured? He had been tortured before the Bishop of Paris three months ere he made confession. His hands had been tied behind him till the blood burst from his nails. He had stood

¹ "Per vim et propter periculum et timorem, quia torquebantur a Florigerano de Biturres, priori Montefalconis, Gulielmo Roberto monacho, inimicis eorum." This is a new and terrible fact, that the accusers, even the Prior of Montfalcon, were the *torturers*!

² Moldenhauer says that they gave in a paper, "Ces sont les treytours, liquel ont proposé fauseté et debaute contre leste de la Religion deu Temple, Guilealmes Robers Moynes, qui les mitoyet a geinas; Esquino de Flexian de Biterris, en Priens de Montfaucon, Bernard Pelete Priens de Maso de Genoïs, et Everannes de Boxxol, Echaliier vencus a Gisors" (*sic*). —p. 33.

thus in a pit for the space of an hour.¹ He protested that in that state of agony he should confess or deny whatever they would. He was prepared to endure beheading, the stake, or the caldron, for the honor of the Order; but these slow, excruciating torments he could not bear, besides the horrors of his two years' imprisonment. He was asked if he had anything to allege wherefore the Court should not proceed. He hoped that the cause would be decided by good men and true.² The Provost of Poitiers interposed; he produced a schedule of charges advanced by Ponsard himself against the Order. "Truth," answered Ponsard, "requires no concealment. I own that, in a fit of passion, on account of some contumelious words with the Treasurer of the Temple, I did draw up that schedule." Those charges, however, dark as were some of them, were totally unlike those now brought against the brotherhood. Before he left the Court Ponsard expressed his hope that the severity of his imprisonment might not be aggravated because he had undertaken the defence of the Order. The Court gave instructions to the Provost of Poitiers and De Jamville that he should not be more harshly treated.

On the Friday before the Feast of St. Andrew
 Du Molay Du Molay appeared again. De Plasian had
 again. alarmed, or persuaded or caressed him to a more calm and suppliant demeanor. He thanked the commissioners for their indulgence in granting delay. Asked if he would defend the Order, he said that "he was an unlettered and a poor man. The Pope had reserved for its own decision the judgment on himself and other heads of the Order. He prayed

¹ Leuge.

² See also this in the Procès and in Moldenhauer, p. 35.

to be brought, as speedily as might be (for life was short), into the presence of the Pope." Asked whether he saw cause why the Court should not proceed, not against individual Knights, but against the Order, he replied, "None; but to disburden his conscience, he must aver three things: I. That no religious edifices were adorned with so much splendor and beauty as the chapels of the Templars, nor the services performed with greater majesty, except in cathedral churches; II. That no Order was more munificent in alms-giving; III. That no Brotherhood and no Christians had confronted death more intrepidly, or shed their blood more cheerfully for the cause of Christ." He especially referred to the rescue of the Count of Artois. The Court replied that these things profited not to salvation, where the groundwork of the faith was wanting. Du Molay professed his full belief in the Trinity, and in all the articles of the Catholic faith.

William of Nogaret came forward, and inquired whether it was not written in the Chronicles of St. Denys, that Saladin had publicly declared, on a certain defeat of the Templars, that it was "a judgment of God for their apostasy from their faith, and for their unnatural crimes." Du Molay was amazed; "he had never heard this in the East." He acknowledged that he and some young Knights, eager for war, had murmured against the Grand Master, William de Beaujeu, because he kept peace with the Sultan, peace which turned out to be a wise measure. He entreated to be allowed the mass and the divine offices, to have his chapel and his chaplain. He withdrew, never to leave his prison till some years after, to be burned alive.

Up to this time none but the prisoners confined in Paris had been brought before the Commission. It was still found that the citations had been but partially served in the prisons of the other provinces.

Prisoners from the provinces. Letters were again written to the Archbishops and Bishops, enjoining them to send up all the Templars who would undertake the defence of the Order to Paris. The King issued instructions to the Bailiffs and Seneschals of the realm to provide horses and conveyances, and to furnish a strong and sufficient guard. This was the special office of the Provost of Poitiers, and John de Jamville, who had the general custody of the captives in the provinces of Sens, Rheims, and Rouen. The prisons of Orleans were crowded. They were compelled to disgorge all Feb. 2, 1310. their inmates. The appointed day was the morrow after the Purification. From that day till the end of March the prisoners came pouring in from all parts of the kingdom. Great numbers had died of torture, of famine, of shame and misery at their confinement in fetid and unwholesome dungeons, men accustomed to a free and active life. The survivors came, broken in spirit by torture, not perhaps sure that the Papal Commission would maintain its unusual humanity; most of them with the burden of extorted confessions, which they knew would rise up against them. Perhaps some selection was made. Some, no doubt, the more obstinate, and the more than obstinate, those who had recanted their confessions, were kept carefully away. Yet even under these depressing, crushing circumstances their numbers, their mutual confidence in each other, the glad open air, the face of man, before whom they were now to bear them-

selves proudly, and — vague hope! — some reliance on the power, the justice, or the mercy of the Pope, into whose hands they might seem to have passed from that of the remorseless King, gave them courage. They heard with undisguised murmurs of indignation the charges now publicly made against the Order, against themselves: the blood boiled as of old; the soldier nerved himself in defiance of his foe.

The first interrogatory, to which all at the time collectively before the Court¹ were exposed, was whether they would defend the Order. By Asked if they will defend the Order. Feb. 3. far the larger number engaged with unhesitating intrepidity. There were some hundreds. Dreadful tales transpired of their prison-houses. Of those from St. Denys John de Baro had been three times tortured, and kept twelve weeks on bread and water. Of those from Tyers one declared that twenty-five of the Brethren had died in prison of torture and suffering: he asserted that if the Host were administered to them, God would work a miracle to show which spoke truth, those who confessed or those who denied. Of the twenty who arrived later from the province of Sens one, John of Cochiac, produced a letter from the Provost of Poitiers, addressed to Laurence de Brami, once

¹ See the detail — from Clermont 34, from Sens 6, from the Bishopric of Amiens 12, from that of Paris about 10, from Tours 7 or 8 (of the Touraine Templars, some would defend themselves, not the Order, some as far as themselves were concerned), from St. Martin des Champs in Paris 14, from Nismes 7, from Monlhery 8, from the Temple 34, from Aris in the diocese of Paris 19, from the Castle of Corbeil 38, from St. Denys 7, from Beauvais 10, from Chalons 9, from Tyers in the diocese of Sens 10, from Carcassonne 28. There came from the province of Sens 20 more; there came from Sammartine in the diocese of Meaux 14; from Auxerre 4, from Crevecoeur 18, from Toulouse 6, from Poitiers 13, from Cressi 6, from Moisiac 6, from Jamville (Orleans) 21, from Gisors 58, from Vernon 13, from Bourges diocese 14, from the archdiocese of Lyons 22.

commander in Apulia, and to other prisoners, urging them to deny to the Bishop of Orleans that they had been tampered with, and pressed to confess falsehoods: to act according to the advice of John Chiapini, "the beloved clerk;" and warning them that the Pope had ordered all who did not persevere in their confessions to be burned at once.¹ The Provost, having examined the document with seeming care, said, that he did not believe that he had written such a letter, or that it was sealed with his seal: "a certain clerk sometimes kept his seal, but he had not urged the prisoners to speak anything but the truth." One of those from Toulouse had been so dreadfully tortured by fire, that some of the bones of his feet had dropped out; he produced them before the Court.

These many hundred Knights, Clerks, and Servitors, a great majority at least of those before the Court, resolved, notwithstanding their former sufferings, to defend their Order. Some of their answers were striking from their emphatic boldness. "To death." "To the end." "To the peril of my soul." "I have never confessed, never will confess, those base calumnies." "Give us the sacrament on the oaths, and let God judge." "With my body and my soul." "Against all men, against all living, save the King and the Pope." "I have made some confession before the Pope, but I lied. I revoke all, and will stand to the defence of the Order."² Those who declined,³ alleged

Undertake
the defence.

¹ Procès, p. 75.

² Raynouard gives the names (p. 271), confirmed by the Procès.

³ There seems to have been less boldness and resolution among the great officers of the Order; perhaps they were old and more sorely tried. John de Tournon, the Treasurer of the Temple in Paris, refused to undertake their defence. William of Arteblay, the king's almoner, would not offer

different excuses, some would defend themselves, not the Order; some would not undertake the defence, unauthorized by the Grand Master; some were simple men, unversed in such proceedings; one with simplicity, which seemed like irony, "would not presume to litigate with the King and the Pope." Very few, indeed, with Gerhard de Lorinche, refused "because there were many bad points in the Order." Many entreated that they might be relieved from some of the hardships of their prisons: that they might be admitted to the holy offices of the Church; some that they might resume the habit of the Order.

On the 25th of March the Knights, who had undertaken the defence, were assembled in the garden of the Archbishop's palace at Paris, to the number of five hundred and fifty-six; their names are extant in full.¹ The Papal commission, and the articles exhibited against the Order, which had been drawn up, to the number of one hundred and twenty-seven, by the King and his counsellors,² and which had before been read³ and explained in French to about ninety persons, were now read again in Latin at full length. They contained, in minute legal particularity, every charge which had been adduced before. As the notary was proceeding to translate the charges, a gen-

Defenders
before the
Court.

himself for that purpose. Godfrey de Gonaville, Preceptor of Poithou and Aquitaine, said that he was a prisoner, a rude unlettered man: before the King and the Pope, whom he held for good lords and just judges, he would speak what was right, but not before the Commissioners. The Commissioners pledged themselves for his full security and freedom of speech — p. 100. "*Nec deberet timere de aliquibus violenciis injuriis vel tormentis, quia non inferrent nec inferri permitterent, immo impedirent si inferri deberent.*" — p. 88. This is noteworthy.

¹ In the Procès; Moldenhauer has 556, Haveman says 544

² Raynouard, whom Haveman quotes, p. 246.

³ March 14.

eral outcry arose that they did not need to hear, that they would not hear, such foul, false, and unutterable things in the vulgar tongue.

The Commissioners, in order to proceed with regularity, commanded the prisoners to select from among themselves six or eight or ten proctors to conduct the defence: they promised to these proctors full freedom of speech. After some deliberation Reginald de Pruin, Preceptor of the Temple in Orleans, and Peter of Bologna, Proctor of the Order in the Roman Court, both lettered men, dictated, in the name of the Knights present, this representation: "It appeared hard to them and to the rest of the Brethren that they had been deprived of the sacraments of the Church, stripped of their religious habit, despoiled of their goods, ignominiously imprisoned and put in chains. They were ill provided with all things: the bodies of those who had died in prison had been buried in unconsecrated ground: in the hour of death they had been denied the Sacrament. No one could act as a proctor without the consent of the Grand Master; they were illiterate and simple, they required therefore the aid and advice of learned Counsel. Many knights of high character had not been permitted to undertake the defence: they named Reginald de Vossiniac and Matthew de Clichy as eminently qualified for that high function.

There was great difficulty in the choice of proctors and in their investiture with powers to act in defence of the Order. The public notaries went round the prisons in which the Templars were confined, to require their assent, if determined on the defence, to the nomination of proctors. The Knights had taken new courage from their short emancipation from their fetters,

from the glimpse of the light of day. About seventy-seven in the Temple dungeons solemnly averred all the articles to be foul, irrational, detestable, horrid, false to the blackest falsehood, iniquitous, fabricated, invented by mendacious witnesses, base, infamous; that "the Temple" is and always was pure and blameless. If they were not permitted to appear in person at the General Council, they prayed that they might appear by some of their Brethren. They asserted all the confessions to be false, wrung from them by torture, or by the fear of torture, and therefore to be annulled and thrown aside; that these things were public, notorious, to be concealed by no subterfuge. Other prisoners put in other pleas of defence, as strong, some of them more convincing from their rashness and simplicity. A few bitterly complained of the miserable allowance for their maintenance: they had to pay two sous for knocking off their irons, when brought up for hearing, and ironing them again.¹

The mass of suffrages, though others were named, were for Peter of Bologna, Reginald de Pruin, priests; William de Chambonnet and Bertrand de Salleges, knights, as those in whom they had greatest confidence as proctors. Already on the 1st of April these four with Matthew de Clichy and Robert Vigier had given in a written paper, stating that without the approbation of the Grand Master they could not act. The Grand Master, the chief Preceptors of France, Guienne, Cyprus, and Normandy, and the other Brethren, must be withdrawn from the custody of the King's officers, and delivered to that of the Church, as it was notorious that they dared not, through fear, or through seduction and

¹ Procès, passim, at this period.

false promises, consent to the defence of the Order, and that false confessions would be adduced so long as the cause should last.¹ They demanded everything requisite to defend the cause, especially the counsel of learned lawyers; full security for the proctors and their counsel: that the apostate Brethren, who had thrown off the habit of the Order, should be taken into the custody of the Church till it should be ascertained whether they had borne true or false witness,² for it was well known that they had been corrupted by solicitations and bribes; that the priests who had heard the dying confessions of the Templars should be examined as to those confessions; that the accusers should appear before the Court, and be liable to the *Lex Talionis*.

On the 7th of April they appeared again with William de Montreal, Matthew de Cresson Essart, John de St. Leonard, and William de Grinsac. Peter of Bologna read the final determination of the Brethren:—

Protest of the Proctors. “They could not, without leave from the Grand Master, appoint proctors, but they were content that the four, the two priests, Peter of Bologna and De Pruin, the two Knights, De Chambonnet and Salleges, should appear for the defence, produce all documents, allege all laws, and watch the whole proceedings in their behalf. They demanded that no confession, extorted by solicitation, reward, or fear, should be adduced to their prejudice; that all the false Brethren, who had thrown off the habit of the Order, should be kept in safe custody by the Church till found

¹ “*Quia scimus predictos fratres non audere consentire defensionis ordinis propter eorum metum et seductionem, et falsas promissiones, quia quamdiu durabit causa, durabit et confessio falsa.*” — p. 127.

² This was probably aimed especially at Squino de Florian and his colleagues.

true or mendacious ; that no layman should be present at the hearing, no one who might cause reasonable dread ; ” for the Brethren were in general so downcast in mind from terror, that it is less surprising that they should tell lies than speak truth, when they compare the tribulation, anguish, insults endured by those who speak truth, with the advantages, enjoyments, freedom of those who speak falsehood.¹ “ It is amazing that those should be believed who are thus corrupted by personal advantage rather than the martyrs of Christ, who endure the worst afflictions : ” “ they aver that no Knight in all the world out of the realm of France has or would utter such lies : it is manifest therefore that they that do this in France are seduced by terror, influence, or bribery.”² They assert distinctly, deliberately, without reserve, the holiness of the Order ; their fidelity to their three solemn vows of chastity, obedience, poverty ; their dedication to the service of Christ’s Sepulchre ; they avouch the utter mendacity of the articles exhibited against them. “ Certain false Christians, or absolute heretics, moved by the zeal of covetousness, or the ardor of envy, have sought out some few apostates or renegades from the Order (diseased sheep cast out of the fold), and with them have invented and forged all the horrid crimes and wickednesses attributed to the Order. They have poisoned the ears of the Pope and of the King. The Pope and the King, thus misled by designing and crafty counsellors, have permitted their satellites to compel confessions by impris-

¹ “ Quia omnes fratres generaliter tanto terrore, et terrore perculsi, quod non est mirandum quodam modo de hiis qui mentiuntur, sed plus de hiis qui sustinent veritatem.” — p. 166, and in Moldenhauer.

² “ Quare dicta sunt in regno Franciæ, quia, qui dixerunt, corrupti timore prece vel pretio testificati sunt ” !!

onment, torture, the dread of death. Finally, they protested against the form of procedure, as directly contrary to law, an inquisition *ex officio*, because before their arrest, they were not arraigned by public fame, because they are not now in a state of freedom and security, but at the mercy of those who are continually suggesting to the King that he should urge all who have confessed by words, messages, or letters not to retract their false depositions, extorted by fear; for if they retract them, they will be burned alive.”¹

William de Montreal presented another protest in Provençal French, somewhat different in terms, insisting on their undoubted privilege of being judged by the Pope and the Pope alone.

These protests had no greater effect than such protests usually have; they were overruled by the Commissioners, who declared themselves determined to proceed.

On April 11th, on the eve of Palm Sunday, the witnesses, how chosen is unknown, were brought forward: oaths of remarkable solemnity were administered in the presence of the four advocates of the Order. The depositions of the first witnesses were loose and unsatisfactory, resting on rumor and suspicion. Raoul de Prael had some years before heard Gervais, Prior of the Temple at Laon, declare that the Templars had a great and terrible secret, he would have his head cut off rather than betray it. Nicolas Domizelli, Provost of the Monastery of Fassat, had heard his uncle, who entered the Order twenty-five years before, declare that the same Gervais had used the same language concerning the secret usages of the Order. He had himself wished to enter the Order,

¹ p. 140.

but, though he was very rich, Gervais had raised difficulties. Some of the Court adjourned to the death-bed of John de St. Benedict, Preceptor of Isle Bochart. John underwent, though said to be at the point of death, a long interrogatory. He confessed, as they reported, the denial of Christ and spitting on the Cross at his reception : of the idol, or of the other charges he knew nothing. Guiscard de Marsiac had heard of the obscene kisses. His relative, Hugh de Marchant, after he had entered the Order, had become profoundly melancholy ; he called himself a lost man, had a seal stamped "Hugh the Lost." Hugh, however, had died, after confession to a Friar Minor and having received the Holy Sacrament, in devotion and peace. Then came two servitors, under the suspicious character of renegades, having cast off the dress of the Order, John de Taillefer, and John de Hinquemet, an Englishman. They deposed to the denial of Christ, the spitting on the Cross, the denial with their lips not their hearts (as almost every one did), the spitting near not on the Cross.

The Court adjourned for the Festival of Easter, and resumed its sittings on the Thursday in Easter ^{Easter.} week. The four defenders had become still more emboldened, perhaps by the meagre and inconclusive evidence. They put in a new protest against ^{New pro-} the proceedings, as hasty, violent, sudden, in-^{test.} iquitous, and without the forms of law. The Brethren had been led like sheep to the slaughter ; they recounted again the imprisonments, the tortures, under which many had died, many were maimed for life, by which some had been compelled to make lying confessions. Further, letters had been shown to the Brethren, with

the King's seal attached, promising them, if they would bear witness against the Order, safety of life and limb, ample provision for life, and assuring them at the same time that the Order was irrevocably doomed. They demanded a list of the witnesses, so that they might adduce evidence as to their credibility ; that those who had given their depositions should be separated and kept apart from those who had not, so that there might be no collusion or mutual understanding ; that the depositions should be kept secret ; that every witness should be informed that he might speak the truth without fear, because his deposition would not be divulged till it had been laid before the Pope. They demanded that the laymen De Plasian, De Nogaret, and others should not be present in the spiritual court to overawe the judges ; they demanded that those who had the custody of the Templars should be interrogated as to the testimony given concerning the Order by the dying in their last hours.

The examinations began again. Another servitor, Huguet de Buris, who, with a fourth, had shared the dungeon of Taillefer and John the Englishman, deposed much to the same effect. Gerard de Passages gave more extraordinary evidence. Seventeen years after his reception he had abandoned the Order for five years on account of the foul acts which had taken place at his reception. After the usual rigorous oaths had been administered, a crucifix of wood was produced : he was asked whether he believed that cross to be God. He replied that it was the image of the Crucified. It was answered, " this is but a piece of wood ; God is in heaven." He was commanded to spit upon and trample on the Cross. He did this,

Examina-
tions re-
sumed.

not compelled, but from his vow of obedience. He kissed his Initiator on the spine of the back. Yet Gerard de Passages, though thus a renegade to the Order, had suffered, he avers, the most horrible tortures before the King's Bailiff at Macon, weights tied to the genitals and other limbs to compel him to a confession of the idol, of which he declared that he knew nothing. Godfrey de Thatan, the fourth of the servitors, "had been forced to the denial of Christ, on his reception, by the threat of being shut up in a place where he could see neither his hands nor his feet." Raymond de Vassiniac made an admission for the first time of one of the fouler charges, but denied MAY 6. the actual guilt of the Order. Baldwin de St. Just, Preceptor of Ponthieu, had been twice examined, twice put to the torture, at Amiens by the Friar Preachers, at Paris before the Bishop. The sharper tortures at Amiens had compelled him to confess more than the less intolerable tortures at Paris, or than he was disposed to avow before the Commissioners. "At his own reception had taken place the abnegation, the insult to the Cross, the license to commit unnamable vices. But at the reception of four Brothers, one his own nephew, at which he had been present, nothing of the kind." The servitor James of Troyes was the most ready witness: he had left the Order four years before from love of a woman. Besides the usual admissions, he had heard, he could not say from whom, that a head was worshipped at the midnight Chapters. The Court itself mistrusted the ease, fluency, and contradictions of this witness.¹

¹ "Predictus testis videbatur esse valde facilis et procax ad loquendum et in pluribus dictis suis non esse stabilis, sed quasi varians et vacillans."

Still during all these examinations new batches of Knights were brought in, almost all of them eager to undertake the defence of the Order. As yet, considering the means unscrupulously used to obtain evidence, the evidence had been scanty, suspicious, resting chiefly on low persons of doubtful fidelity to their vows. Hope, even something like triumph, might be rising in the hearts, faintly gleaming on the countenances of the Templars. The Court itself might seem somewhat shaken: the weighty protests, unanswered and unanswerable, could hardly be without some effect. Who could tell the turn affairs might take?

But now, at this crisis, terrible rumors began to spread that the Archbishop of Sens, in defiance and in contempt of the supreme Papal tribunal, was proceeding (as Metropolitan of Paris) against all who had retracted their confessions, as relapsed heretics. These were the first fruits of the Archbishop's gratitude to the King for his promotion extorted from the reluctant Pope: he had not been a month enthroned!

Stephen, Archbishop of Sens, had died about the Easter of the preceding year. The Pope declared his determination himself to nominate the Metropolitan of this important See, of which the Bishop of Paris was a Suffragan. But the King requested, he demanded the See for Philip, the brother of his faithful minister, Enguerrand de Marigni, the author and adviser of all his policy. Clement struggled with some resolution, but gave way at length; he acceded ungraciously, reluctantly, but still acceded.

At Easter Philip de Marigni received his pall. Almost his first act was to summon a Provincial

Archbishop
of Sens.

Philip de
Marigni.

A. D. 1310.

Council to sit in judgment on the Templars who had retracted their confessions. The rapid deliberations of this Council were known to be drawing to a close. On Sunday the four defenders demanded a special ^{Appeal to the} audience of the Commissioners. They put ^{Commis-} ^{sioners.} in a strong protest against the acts of the Archbishop; they entreated the intervention of the Commissioners to arrest these iniquitous proceedings; they appealed to their authority, to their justice, to their mercy for their Brethren now on trial before another Court. The Archbishop of Narbonne withdrew under the pretext of hearing or celebrating mass. It was not till the evening that they obtained a cold reply. "The proceedings of the Archbishop related to different matters than those before the Court: the trial of relapsed heretics. The Commissioners had no authority to inhibit the Archbishop of Sens and his Suffragans: they would, however, deliberate further on the subject."

They had no time for deliberation. The next day De Marigni's Council closed its session. The ^{Decision of} Archbishop pronounced all who had retracted ^{the Council.} their confessions, and firmly adhered to their retraction, relapsed heretics. It was strange, stern logic: "You have confessed yourself to be guilty of heresy, on that confession you have received absolution. If you retract your confessions, the Church treats you not as reconciled sinners, but as relapsed heretics, and as heretics adjudges you to be burned." It was in vain urged that their heresy rested on their own confession; that confession withdrawn, there was no proof of their heresy. Those who persisted in their confession, were set at liberty, declared reconciled to the Church, provided for by the King. Those who had made no con-

fession, and refused to make one, were declared not reconciled to the Church, and ordered to be detained in prison, which might be perpetual. For the relapsed there was a darker destiny.

On May 12th fifty-four stakes, encircled with dry wood, were erected outside the Porte St. Antoine. Fifty-four Templars were led forth — men, some of noble birth, many in the full health and strength of manhood.¹ The habits of their Order were rent from them ; each was bound to the stake, with an executioner beside him. The herald proclaimed for the last time that those who would confess should be set at liberty. Kindred and friends thronged around weeping, beseeching, imploring them to submit to the King. Not one showed the least sign of weakness: they resolutely asserted the innocence of the Order, their own faith as Christians. The executioners slowly lit the wood, which began to scorch, to burn, to consume their extremities. The flames rose higher ; and through the crackling might be heard the howlings of the dying men, their agonizing prayers to Christ, to the Blessed Virgin, to the Saints. Not one but died an unshrinking and resolute martyr to the guiltlessness of the Order. The people looked on in undisguised sympathy. “ Their souls,” says one chronicler, “ incurred deeper damnation, for they misled the people into grievous error.”² Day after day went on the same sad spectacle. On the eve of the Ascension, four were burned, among them the King’s Almoner. One hundred and thirteen were burned in Paris alone, and not one apostate !

¹ Raynouard (pp. 109-111) has recovered the names of most of the fifty-four.

² *Chroniques de St. Denys*. The best account is in Villani, viii. xcii., *Zantfleet Chronicon*, apud Martene, v. p. 159.

The examinations were going on, meantime, before the Papal Commission. The day when it was well known that the Archbishop was ^{Examinations proceed.} about to condemn the recreants to the flames, Humphry de Puy, a servitor, gave the most intrepid denial to the whole of the charges: he had been three times tortured, kept in a dungeon on bread and water for twenty-six weeks. He described his own reception as solemn, secret, and austere. He had heard rumors of such things as were said to have taken place; he did not believe one word of them. Throughout his denial was plain, firm, unshaken. John Bertaldi was under examination when the tidings of the burnings at the Porte St. Antoine were made known. The Commissioners sent a tardy and feeble petition at least for delay, and to inform the Archbishop and the King's officers that the Templars had entered an appeal to the Council of Vienne. This was all!

The next day Aymeric de Villars le Duc appeared before the Commissioners, pale, bewildered; yet on his oath, and at peril of his soul, he imprecated upon himself, if he lied, instant death, and that he might be plunged body and soul, in sight of the Court, into hell. He smote his breast, lifted his hands in solemn appeal to the altar, knelt down, and averred all the crimes imputed to the Order utterly false: though he had been tortured by G. de Marillac and Hugo de Celle, the King's officers, to partial confession. He had seen the wagons in which the fifty-four had been led to be burned, he had heard that they had been burned. He doubted whether, if he should be burned, he would not through fear confess anything, and confess it on his oath, even if he were asked if he had slain the Lord.

He entreated the Commissioners, he even entreated the notaries not to betray his secret lest he should be condemned to the same fate as his Brethren.

The Commissioners found the witnesses utterly paralyzed with dread, and only earnest that their confessions or retractations of their confessions, might not be revealed; above forty abandoned the defence in despair. So, after some unmeaning communications with the Archbishop of Sens, they determined to adjourn the Court for some months, till November 3d.

In the mean time other Metropolitans and Bishops followed the summary and barbarous proceedings of Philip Marigni of Sens.¹ The Archbishop of Rheims held a Council at Senlis; nine Templars were burned: the Archbishop of Rouen at Pont de l'Arche; the number of victims is not known, but they were many.² The Bishop of Carcassonne held his Council: John Cassantras, Commander in Carcassonne, with many others perished in the fire.³ Duke Thiebault of Lorraine, who had seized the goods of the Templars, ordered great numbers to execution. None retracted their retractation of their confession.⁴

On November 3d the Commission resumed its sittings, but most of the Commissioners were weary or disgusted with their work. Three only were present. The Archbishop of Narbonne and the Bishop of Bayeux were elsewhere employed, it was alleged, on the

¹ Continuator Nangis. — Vit. Clement. VI.

² Histoire des Archevêques de Rouen, quoted by Raynouard, p. 120.

³ Hist. Eccles. de Carcassonne. — Ibid.

⁴ "Unum autem mirandum fuit, quod omnes et singuli sigillatim confessiones suas quas prius fecerant in iudicio, et jurati confessi fuerant dicere veritatem, penitus retractaverunt, dicentes se falso dixisse prius et se fuisse mentitos, nullam super hæc reddentes causam nisi vim vel metum tormentorum, quod de se talia faterentur." — iv. vit. Clement, p. 72.

King's business. The Archdeacon of Maguelonne wrote from Montpellier to excuse himself on account of illness. The Bishop of Limoges withdrew: a letter to the King had been seen, disapproving the reopening of the Commission till the meeting of a Parliament summoned for the day of St. Vincent.¹ They adjourned to the 17th of December.² The Commission was then more full; the Archbishop of Narbonne and four others took their seats. Of the four proctors, the Knights William de Chambonnet and Bernard de Salleges alone appeared. Peter of Bologna and Reginald de Pruin, it was asserted, had renounced the defence. Peter de Bologna was heard of no more; he was reported to have broken prison. Reginald de Pruin, as having been degraded by the Archbishop, was deemed disqualified to act for the Order. Thus was the defence crippled. In vain the Knights, unlettered men, demanded counsel to assist them: they too abandoned the desperate office. The Court, released from their importunate presence, could proceed with greater despatch. Lest any new hindrance should occur, at the suggestion of the Archbishop of Narbonne it was determined that the Commissioners might sit by deputy.

The Court sat from the 17th of December to the 26th of May. Not less, on the whole, than two hundred and thirty-one witnesses were heard. It cannot now be wondered if the confessions were more in accordance with the views of the King. The most intrepid of the Knights had died at the stake; every one who retracted his confession must make up his mind to be burned. On the other hand, the Order seemed irretrievably doomed: while confession might

¹ Jan. 22.

² By an error in the Document, Oct. 17.

secure themselves, the most stubborn assertor of the blamelessness of the Order could not avert its dissolution. A few appeared in the habit of the Order, with the long beard: most had either thrown it off, or it had been taken from them, they appeared shaven. This was the case with all who had been absolved by the Church.

The confessions, upon strict examination, manifestly betray this predominant feeling of terror and despair. Some there were who nobly, obstinately denied the whole. Those who confessed, confessed as little as they could, enough to condemn the Order, yet not to inculpate, or to inculpate as little as possible, themselves. The confessions are constantly clashing and contradictory.¹ Men present at certain receptions assert things to have taken place, which others, also present, explicitly deny. The general conclusion was this. Many dwelt on the difficulties which were raised against their admission to the Order. They were admonished that they must not expect to ride about in splendid attire on stately horses, and to live easy and luxurious lives; they had to submit to austere discipline, stern self-denial, almost intolerable privations and hardships. When they would wish to be beyond the sea, they would be thwarted in their wishes; when they would sleep, they would be forced to watch; when to eat, to fast. They were asked if they believed the Catholic faith of the Church of Rome; if they were in Holy Orders, married, under the vows of any other Brotherhood; whether they had given bribe or promise to any Knight Templar to obtain admission

¹ Raynouard has, with much ingenuity and truth, brought together the direct contradictions. — p. 157 *et. seq.*

into the Order. "Ye ask a great thing," replied the Knight who admitted them to their request.

The first and public act of reception,¹ all agreed, was most severe, solemn, impressive. The three great vows of obedience, chastity, abandon-^{Result of confessions.}ment of property, were administered with awful gravity. Then it was, according to the confession of most who confessed anything, that, after they had been clothed in the dress of the Order, they were led aside into some private chamber or chapel, and compelled, either in virtue of their vow of obedience, or in dread of some mysterious punishment, to deny Christ, to spit on the Cross. Yet, perhaps without exception, all swore that they had denied with their lips, not with their heart; that they spat, beside, above, below, not on the Cross.² All declared that never after had any attempt been made to confirm them in apostasy from Christ: ³ all declared that they fully believed the whole creed of the Church; almost all that they believed all their Brethren to have perfect faith in Christ. There were some singular variations and explanations of the denial. One believed it to be a mere test of their absolute obedience; another a probation, as to whether they were of sufficient resolution to be sent to the Holy Land, where, in the power of the Mohammedans, they might be compelled to choose between death and the abnegation of their Redeemer: ⁴ some that it

¹ See the most full account of the reception by Gerard de Causse, p. 179 *et seq.*

² "Juxta non super."

³ Albert de Canellis, preceptor in Sicily, and door-keeper of Pope Benedict XI., was told, when he denied Christ, "that the Crucified was a false prophet; and that he must not believe or have hope or trust in him." — p. 425.

⁴ One had confessed it to a Friar Minor, "et dixit ei dictus frater quod

was a mysterious allusion to the denial of St. Peter ; some that it was an idle jest ;¹ some that it was treated lightly, " Go, fool, and confess." Many had confessed the crime, most usually to Minorite Friars, and, though their confession shocked the priest, they received, after some penance, full absolution. Most of those who acknowledged the abnegation of Christ, admitted the obscene kiss : some that it was but a brotherly kiss on the mouth ; some had received, some had been compelled to bestow this sign of obedience : it was sometimes on the navel, sometimes between the shoulders, sometimes at the bottom of the spine, sometimes, very rarely, lower : it was sometimes on the naked person, more often through the clothes. Here stopped the admissions of great numbers ; this they thought would suffice ; the whole of the rest they denied. Others went further : some admitted the permission to commit unnatural crimes, though in the charge on reception the sin was declared to be relentlessly punished by perpetual imprisonment ; but all swore vehemently that they had never committed such crimes ; had never been tempted or solicited to commit them ; offences of this kind were very rare, and punished by expulsion from the Order. Some said that they were told it was better to sin so than with women to deter from that sin : some took it merely as an injunction hospitably to

ipse in articulo mortis et aliter audiverat confessiones multorum fratrum dicti ordinis, et nunquam intellexit prædicta, sed credebatur quod hoc fecissent, ad temptandum, si contingeret eum capi ultra mare a Saracenis, an abnegaret Deum." — p. 405. Another Friar-Priest took the same view of the denials, and added, "*Quia, si non negasset, forsitan citius misissent eum ultra mare.*" — p. 525. Peter de Charrat said that after his abnegation, "*Dictus Odo incepit subridere, quasi dispiciendo ipsum testem.*"

¹ Truffas. It was done "truffatorie."

share their bed with a Brother: they wore their dress night and day, with a cord which bound it close.¹

Of the idol but few had heard; still fewer seen it. It was a cat; it was a human head with two The Idols. faces; it was of stone or metal, with features which might be discerned, or was utterly shapeless; it was the head of one of the eleven thousand virgins:² no one idol could be produced, though every mansion of the Templars, and all their most secret treasures, were in the hands of their enemies, had been seized without warning or time for concealment, and searched with the most deliberate scrutiny. In the midst of the examinations came, in a Latin writing from Vercelli, from Antonio Siri, a notary, this wild story, followed by another not less extravagant. A renegade in Sicily had divulged the secret. A Lord of Sidon had loved a beautiful woman: he had never enjoyed her before her death. After her death he disinterred and abused her body. The fruit of this unholy and loathsome connection was a head; and this head, a talisman of good fortune, was the idol of the Templars.³

Most of the interrogated seemed to think that they had satisfied all demands when they had made admissions on the first few questions: to the rest they gave a general denial, or pleaded total ignorance. There were some vague answers about secret midnight chapters, of absolution spoken by the Grand Master, but rarely,

¹ Theobald of Tavernay added to his indignant denial of those crimes, "We had always money enough to purchase the favors of the most beautiful women." — p. 326.

² William de Arreblay, the king's almoner, before his apprehension, had believed it to be the head of one of these Virgins; since, from what he had heard in prison, suspected it was an idol, for it seemed to have two faces, was terrible to see, and had a silver beard! — p. 502.

³ Pp. 645-6.

except in the absence of a priest, or it was conditional, and to be confirmed by a priest: very few knew anything of the omission of the words at the consecration of the host. But throughout they are the confessions of men under terror, some in an agony of dread, others from the remembrance or the fear of torture, or of worse than torture. John de Pollencourt at first protested again and again that he would adhere to his confession made before the Bishop of Amiens that he had denied Christ. The Commissioners saw that he was pale and shivering; they exhorted him to speak the truth, for neither they nor the notaries would betray his secret. He then solemnly denied the whole and every particular; averred that he had made his confession before the Inquisitors from fear of death; that Giles de Boutongi, one of the former witnesses, had urged on him and many others in the prison of Montreuil that they would lose their lives if they did not assist in the dissolution of the Order by confessing the abnegation of Christ and the spitting on the cross.¹ Three days after, the same John de Pollencourt entreats another hearing, not only retracts his retractation, but adds to his former confession, acknowledging the license to commit nameless sins, but denies the worship of the idol-cat. John de Cormeli, Preceptor of Moisiac, at first seems to assert the perfect sanctity of the initiation. Being pressed as to anything unseemly having taken place, he hesitates, entreats to speak with the Commissioners in private. The Commissioners decline this, but seeing him bewildered with the terror of torture (he had lost four teeth by torture at Paris), allow him to retire and deliberate. Some days after he ap-

¹ P. 368.

pears again with a full confession.¹ John de Rumfrey had confessed because he had been three times tortured. Robert Vigier denied all the charges; he had confessed on account of the violence of the tortures inflicted on him at Paris by the Bishop of Nevers:² three of his brethren had died under the torture. Stephen de Domant was utterly bewildered; he confessed to the denial and the spitting on the cross. "Would he maintain this in the face of the Knight who had received him, and so give him the lie?" He would not.³ The Court saw that he was shattered by the tortures undergone two years before under the Bishop of Paris.

All these depositions, signed, sealed, attested, authenticated, were transmitted to the Pope.⁴

It was not in France alone that the Templars were arrested, interrogated, in some kingdoms, and by the Pope's order, submitted to torture. In ^{Templars in} England.

¹ P. 506.² P. 514.³ P. 557.

⁴ M. Michelet writes thus in the Preface to the second volume of the *Procès des Templiers*, which, it must be admitted, contains on the whole a startling mass of confessions: "Il suffit de remarquer, que dans les interrogatoires que nous publions, les dénégations sont presque *toutes identiques*, comme si elles étaient dictées d'un formulaire convenu, qu'au contraire les aveux sont *tous différens*, variés de circonstances spéciales, souvent très naïves, qui leur donnent un caractère particulier de vérité. Le contraire doit avoir lieu, si les aveux avaient été dictés ou arrachés par les tortures; ils seraient à peu près semblables, et la diversité se trouverait plutôt dans les dénégations." I confess that my impression of the fact is different, though I am unwilling to set my opinion on this point against that of the Editor of the *Proceedings*. But the fact itself, if true, strikes me just in the contrary way. The denegations were simple denials; the avowals, those of persons who had suffered or feared torture or death, who were bewildered, desperate of saving the Order, and spoke therefore whatever might please or propitiate the judges. Truth is usually plain, simple; falsehood desultory, circumstantial, contradictory. In their confessions they were wildly bidding for their lives. Whatever you wish us to say, we will say it; a few words more or less matters not; or a few more assenting answers to questions which suggested those answers. Twenty-five examined at Elne in Rousillon had not been tortured; they denied calmly, consistently, the whole. — Tom. ii. p. 421.

England, Edward II., after the example of his father-in-law, and in obedience to the Pope's repeated injunctions, and to his peremptory Bull, had seized with the same despatch, and cast into different prisons, all the Templars in England, Wales, and Ireland; Scotland had done the same. The English Templars were under custody in London, Lincoln, and York. From Lincoln, before the interrogatory, great part, but not all, were transferred to the Tower of London, to the care of John Cromwell, the Constable.¹ The first proceeding was before Ralph Baldock, Bishop of London. On the 21st of October he opened the inquest on forty Knights, including the Grand Master, William de la More, in the chapter-house of the monastery of the Holy Trinity, in the presence of the Papal Commissioners, Deodate, Abbot of Lagny, and Sicard de St. Vaur, Canon of Narbonne, Auditor of the Pope.² The questions were at first far more simple, far less elaborately drawn out than those urged in France.³ The chief points were these: ⁴ — Whether the chapters and the reception of knights were held in secret and by night; whether in those chapters were committed any offences against Christian morals or the faith of the Church; whether any one had suspected such offences; whether they knew that any individual brother had denied the Redeemer and worshipped idols; whether they themselves held heretical opinions on any of the sacraments. The examination was conducted with grave

¹ "Ut commodius et efficacius procedi potest ad inquisitionem." — Rymer, 1309.

² Wilkins, *Concilia Mag. Britann.* ii. p. 334.

³ *Concil. Magn. Britann.* ii. 347. I shall be excused for giving the English examinations somewhat more at length. The trials were here at least *more fair*.

⁴ The charges were read to them in Latin, French, and English.

dignity. The warders of the prisons were commanded to keep the witnesses separate, under pain of the greater excommunication: to allow them no intercourse, to permit no one to have access to them. The first four witnesses, William Raven, Hugh of Tadcaster, Thomas Chamberleyn, Ralph of Barton, were interrogated according to the simpler formulary. They described each his reception, by whom, in whose presence it took place; denied calmly, distinctly, specifically, every one of the charges; declared that they believed them to be false, and had not the least suspicion of their truth. Ralph of Barton was a priest; he was recalled, and then first examined, under a more rigid form of oath, on each of the eighty-seven articles used in France, and sanctioned by the Pope. His answer was a plain positive denial in succession of every criminal charge. Forty-seven witnesses deposed fully to the same effect.¹ From all these knights had been obtained not one syllable of confession.² It was determined to admit the testimony of witnesses not of the Order. Nov. 20. Seventeen were examined, clergy, public notaries, and others. Most of them knew nothing against the Templars; the utmost was a vague suspicion arising out of the secrecy with which they held their chapters. One man alone deposed to an overt act of

¹ Thomas de Ludham, the thirty-first witness, said that he had been often urged to leave the Order; but had constantly refused, though he had quite enough to live upon had he done so.

² The forty-fourth, John of Stoke, Chaplain of the Order, was questioned as to the death of William Bachelor, a knight. It appears that Bachelor had been in the prison of the Templars eight weeks, had died, had been buried, not in the cemetery, but in the public way within the Temple, and not in the dress of the Order. He had died excommunicated by the rules of the Order. It was intimated that Bachelor's offence was appropriating some of the goods of the Order.

guilt against a knight, Guy de Forest, who had been his enemy.

From January 29th to February 4th were hearings before the Bishops of London and Chichester, the Papal commissioners, and some others, in St. Martin's, Ludgate, and in other churches, on twenty-nine new articles. I. Whether they knew anything of the infidel and foul crimes charged in the Papal Bull. II. Whether the knights deposed under awe of the Great Preceptor or of the Order. III. Whether the form of reception was the same throughout the world, &c. Thirty-four witnesses, some before examined, persisted in the same absolute denial. On the 8th of June the Inquest dwelt solely on the absolution pronounced by the Grand Preceptor. William de la More deposed that when an offender was brought up before the chapter he was stripped of the dress of the Order, his back exposed, and the President struck three blows with scourges. He then said, "Brother, pray to God to remit thy sins." He turned to those present, "Brethren, pray to God that he remit our brother's sin, and repeat your Pater Noster." He swore that he had never used the form, "I absolve thee, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." This was the case with all offences, save those which could not be confessed without indecency. These he remitted as far as he might by the powers granted to him by God and the Pope.¹ This was the universal practice of the Order. All the witnesses confirmed the testimony of William de la

June 1, 1310. More. Interrogatories were also made at dif-

¹ "Sed alia peccata, quæ non audent confiteri propter erubescen-
tiam carnis vel timorem justitiæ ordinis, ipse ex potestate sibi concessâ, a Deo et
domino Papâ, remittit ei in quantum potest." — p. 357.

ferent times at Lincoln under the Papal Commission, and before the Archbishop at York with the April 28. two Papal Commissioners.¹ All examined denied the whole as firmly and unanimously as at London.

The conclusions to which the chief Court arrived, after these Inquisitions, were in part a full and absolute acquittal of the Order; in part were based on a distorted and unjust view of the evidence; in part on evidence almost acknowledged to be unsatisfactory. The form of reception was declared to be the same throughout the world; of the criminality of that form, or of any of its particular usages, not one word. Certain articles were alleged to be proved: the absolution pronounced by the Grand Preceptor, and by certain lay knights in high office, and by the chapters; also that the reception was by night and secret; that they were sworn not to reveal the secret of their reception (proved by seven witnesses), were liable to be punished for such revelation (by three witnesses); that it was not lawful among themselves to discuss this secret (by three witnesses); that they were sworn to increase the wealth of the Order, by right or wrong;² by four witnesses that they were forbidden to confess except to priests of their own Order.³

The testimony of certain hostile witnesses was all this time kept separate; it was admitted that at the utmost even this was but presumptive against the Order. The Court seemed to have been ashamed of it, as well they might. In one place there is a strong intimation that the witnesses had contradicted and forsworn them-

¹ Thos. Stubbs, *Act. Pontif. Eborac.* apud Twysden, p. 730; also Hemingford.

² "Per fas vel per nefas."

³ *Concil.* p. 548.

selves.¹ To what did it amount, and what manner of men were the witnesses?

An Irish Brother, Henry Tanet, had *heard* that in the East one knight had apostatized to Islam: he had *heard* that the Preceptor of Mount Pelerin in Syria had received knights with the denial of Christ; the names of the knights he knew not. Certain knights of Cyprus (unnamed) were not sound in faith. A certain Templar had a brazen head which answered all questions. He never heard that any knight worshipped an idol, except the apostate to Mohammedanism! and the aforesaid Preceptor.

John of Nassingham had heard from others, who said that they had been told, that at a great banquet given by the Preceptor at York many brothers met in solemn festival to worship a calf.

John de Eure, knight (not of the Order), had invited William de la Fenne, Preceptor of Wesdall, to dinner. De la Fenne, after dinner, had produced a book, and given it to his wife to read, which book denied the virgin birth of the Saviour, and the Redemption: "Christ was crucified, not for man's sins, but for his own." De la Fenne had confessed this before the Inquest. Himself, being a layman, could not know the contents of the book.

William de la Forde, Rector of Crofton, had heard from an Augustinian monk, now dead, that he had heard the confession of Patrick Rippon, of the Order, also dead, a confession of all the crimes charged against the Order. He had heard all this after the apprehension of the Templars at York.

¹ "Suspicio (quæ loco testis 21 in MS. allegatur) probare videtur, quod omnes examinati in aliquo dejeraverunt, ut ex inspectione processuum apparet."

Robert of Oteringham, a Franciscan, had heard a chaplain of the Order say to his brethren, "The devil will burn you," or some such words. He had seen a Templar with his face to the West, his hinder parts towards the altar. Twenty years before, at Wetherby, he had looked through a hole in the wall of a chapel where the Preceptor was said to be busy arranging the relics brought from the Holy Land; he saw a very bright light. Next day he asked a Templar what Saint they worshipped; the Templar turned pale, and entreated him, as he valued his life, to speak no more of the matter.

John Wederal sent in a schedule, in which he testified in writing that he had heard a Templar, one Robert Bayser, as he walked along a meadow, say, "Alas! alas! that ever I was born! I must deny Christ and hold to the devil!"

N. de Chinon, a Franciscan, had heard that a certain Templar had a son who looked through a wall and saw the knights compelling a professing knight to deny Christ; on his refusal they killed him. The boy was asked by his father whether he would be a Templar; the boy refused, saying what he had seen: on which his father killed him also.

Ferins Mareschal deposed that his grandfather entered the Order in full health and vigor, delighting in his hawks and hounds; in three days he was dead: the witness suspected that he would not consent to the wickednesses practised by the Order.

Adam de Heton deposed that when he was a boy it was a common cry among boys, "Beware of the kisses of the Templars."

William de Berney, an Augustinian, had heard that

a certain Templar, he did not know his name, but believed that he was the Preceptor of Duxworthe (near Cambridge), had said that man after death had no more a living soul than a dog.

Roger, Rector of Godmersham, deposed that fifteen years before he had desired to enter the Order. Stephen Quenteril had warned him, "If you were my father, and might become Grand Master of the Order, I would not have you enter it. We have three vows, known only to God, the devil, and the brethren." What those vows were Stephen would not reveal.

William, Vicar of St. Clement in Sandwich, had heard fifteen years before, from a groom in his service, that the said groom had heard from another servant, that the said servant at Dincelee had hid himself under a seat in the great hall where the Templars held their midnight chapters. The President preached to the brethren how they might get richer. All the brethren deposited their girdles in a certain place: one of these girdles the servant found and carried to his master. The master struck him with his sword in the presence of the said groom. William was asked if the groom was living: he did not know.

Thomas Tulyet had heard from the Vicar of Sutton that he had heard a certain priest, who officiated among the Templars, had been inhibited from using the words of consecration in the mass.

John de Gertia, a Frenchman, had heard fourteen years before from a woman named Cacocaca, who lived near some elms in a street in a suburb of London, leading to St. Giles, that Exvalet, Preceptor of London, had told this woman that a servant of certain Templars had concealed himself in their chapter-house at Dine-

lee.¹ The Knights present had retired to a house adjacent (how the witness saw them, appears not); there they opened a coffer, produced a black idol with shining eyes, performing certain disgusting ceremonies. One of them refused to do more (the conversation is given word for word), they threw him into a well, and then proceeded to commit all kinds of abominable excesses. He said that one Walter Savage, who belonged to Earl Warenne, had entered the Order, and after two years disappeared. Agnes Lovekote deposed to the same.

Brother John Wolby de Bust had heard from Brother John of Dingeston that he believed that the charges against the Templars were not without foundation; that he had heard say that the Court of Rome was not dealing in a straightforward manner, and wished to save the Grand Master. The said Brother averred that he knew the place in London where a gilded head was kept. There were two more in England, he knew not where.

Richard de Kocfield had heard from John of Barne that William Bachelor² had said that he had lost his soul by entering into the Order; that there was one article in their profession which might not be revealed.

Gaspar (or Godfrey) de Nafferton, chaplain of Ryde, was in the service of the Templars, at the admission of William de Pocklington. The morning after his admission William looked very sad. A certain Brother Roger had promised Godfrey for two shillings to obtain his admission to see the ceremony. Roger broke his word, and, being reproached by Godfrey, said "he

¹ See above.

² The knight whose mysterious disappearance had been noticed before.

would not have done it for his tabard full of money." "If I had known that," said Godfrey, "I would have seen it through a hole in the wall." "You would inevitably have been put to death, or forced to take the habit of the Order." He also deposed to having seen a Brother copying the secret statutes.

John of Donyngton, a Franciscan, had conversed with a certain veteran who had left the Order. At the Court of Rome he had confessed to the great Penitentiary why he left the Order; that there were four principal idols in England; that William de la More, now Grand Preceptor, had introduced all these into England. De la More had a great roll in which were inscribed all these wicked observances. The same John of Donyngton had heard dark sayings from others, intimating that there were profound and terrible secrets in the Order.¹

Such was the mass of strange, loose, hearsay, antiquated evidence,² much of which had passed through many mouths. This was all which as yet appeared against an Order, arrested and imprisoned by the King, acting under the Pope's Bull, an Order odious from jealousy of its wealth and power, and from its arrogance to the clergy and to the monastic communities;

¹ Wilcke asserts that Bishop Munter had discovered at Rome the report of the Confessions of the English Templars, which was transmitted to the Pope. It is more full, he says, than that in the *Concilia*. I cannot see that Wilcke produces much new matter from this report. His summary is very inaccurate, leaving out everything which throws suspicion on almost every testimony.

² Two Confessions made in France were put in, in which Robert de St. Just and Godfrey de Gonaville had deposed to their reception in England, with all the more appalling and loathsome ceremonies. These confessions do not appear in the *Procès* (by Michelet). Their names occur more than once. Gonaville was chosen by some as a defender of the Order. He was present at many of the receptions, sworn to by the witnesses.

especially to the clergy as claiming exemption from their jurisdiction, and assuming some of their powers: an order which possessed estates in every county (the instructions of the King to the sheriffs of the counties imply that they had property everywhere), at all events vast estates, of which there are ample descriptions. Against the Order torture was, if not generally and commonly applied, authorized at least by the distinct injunctions of the King and of the Pope.¹

At length, towards the end of May, three witnesses were found, men who had fled, and had been excommunicated as contumacious on account of their disobedience to the citation of the Court, men apparently of doubtful character. Stephen Staplebridge is described as a runaway apostate.² He had been apprehended by the King's officers at Salisbury, committed to Newgate, and thence brought up for examination before the Bishops of London and Chichester. Stephen, being sworn, declared that there were

Three witnesses.

¹ Was the torture employed against the Templars in England? It is asserted by Raynour, p. 132. Haveman (p. 305) quotes these instructions, as in Dugdale (they are in the Concilia, ii. p. 314), "Et si per hujusmodi arctationes et separationes nihil aliud quam prius vellent confiteri, quod ex hinc quæstionarentur, ita quod quæstiones illæ fiant absque mutilatione et debilitatione alicujus membri et sine violentâ sanguinis effusione." See also in Rymer, iii. p. 228, the royal order to those who had the Templars in custody, "Quod iidem Prælati et Inquisitores de ipsis Templariis et eorum comparibus, in QUÆSTIONIBUS et aliis ad hoc convenientibus ordinent et faciant, quotiens voluerint, id quod eis, secundum Legem Ecclesiasticam, videbitur faciendum." Orders to the Mayor and Sheriffs of London, "Et corpora dictorum Templariorum in QUÆSTIONIBUS et ad hoc convenientibus ponere." — p. 232. Still there is not the heart-breaking evidence or bitter complaint of its actual application, as in France. The Pope gave positive orders to employ torture in Spain. "Ad habendam ab eis veritatis plenitudinem promptiorem tormentis et quæstionibus, si sponte confiteri noluerint, experiri procuratis." — Raynald. A. D. 1311, c. 54.

² "Apostata fugitivus."

two forms of reception, one good and lawful, one contrary to the faith : at his admission at Dinelee by Brian le Jay, late Grand Preceptor of England, he had been compelled to deny Christ, which he did with his lips, not his heart ; to spit on the Cross — this he escaped by spitting on his own hands. Brian le Jay had afterwards intimated to him that Christ was not very God and very Man. He also averred that those who refused to deny Christ were made away with beyond sea : that William Bachelor had died in prison and in torment, but not for that cause. He made other important admissions : after his confession he threw himself on the ground, with tears, groans, and shrieks, imploring mercy.¹

Thomas Thoroldeby (called Tocci) was said to have been present at the reception of Staplebridge.² On this point he somewhat prevaricated : all the rest he resolutely denied, except that there was a suspicion against the Order on account of their secret chapter. He was asked why he had fled.³ “The Abbot of Lagny had threatened him that he would force him to confess before he was out of their hands.” Thoroldeby had been present when the confessions were made before the Pope ; he had seen, therefore, the treatment of his Brethren in France. Four days after Thoroldeby was brought up again ; what had taken place in the interval may be conjectured ;⁴ he now made the most

¹ This sounds as if he had been tortured, or feared to be.

² They were examined first at St. Martin's in the Vintry ; Thoroldeby, the second time, in St. Mary Overy, Southwark.

³ Walter Clifton examined in Scotland, was asked whether any of the victims had fled, “*propter scandalum*,” “*ob timorem hujusmodi*,” — he named Thomas Tocci as one who had fled. — p. 384.

⁴ Haveman says, “*unstreitig geföhlert*.” It looks most suspicious. — p. 315.

full and ample confession. He had been received fourteen or fifteen years before by Guy Forest. Adam Champmesle and three others had stood over him with drawn swords, and compelled him to deny Christ. Guy taught him to believe only in the Great God. He had heard Brian le Jay say a hundred times that Christ was not very God and very Man. Brian le Jay had said to him that the least hair in a Saracen's beard was worth more than his whole body.¹ He told many other irreverent sayings of Le Jay: there seems to have been much ill-blood between them. He related some adventures in the Holy Land, from which he would imply treachery in the Order to the Christian cause. After his admission into the Order, John de Man had said to him, "Are you a Brother of the Order? If so, were you seated in the belfry of St. Paul's, you would not see more misery than will happen to you before you die."

John de Stoke, Chaplain of the Order, deposed to having been compelled to deny Christ.²

On June 27th these three witnesses, Staplebridge, Thoroldeby, and Stoke, received public absolution, on the performance of certain penances, from Robert Winchelsea, Archbishop of Canterbury, and some of his suffragans. Many other Knights were in like manner

¹ "Quod minimus pilus barbæ unius Saraceni, fuit majoris valoris quam totum corpus istius qui loquitur." — p. 386.

² These are the only three witnesses against the Order who belonged to it, according to the Concilia. Wilcke asserts that in the Vatican Acts, seen by Bishop Munter, there were 17 witnesses to the denial of Christ, 16 to the spitting on the Cross, 8 on disrespect to the Sacraments, 2 on the omission of the words of consecration. But he does not say whether these witnesses were of the Order, and his whole representation of the Confessions from the Concilia is that of a man who has made up his mind. — Wilcke, i. p. 328.

absolved on their humble confession that they had been under evil report,¹ and under suspicion of heresy. It was hoped that the Great Preceptor of England, William de la More, would make his submission, and accept absolution on the same easy terms. But the high spirit of De la More revolted at the humiliation. To their earnest exhortation that he would own at least the usurpation of the power of absolution, and seek pardon of the Church, he replied that he had never been guilty of the imputed heresies, and would not abjure crimes which he had never committed. He was remanded to the prison. The general sentence against the English Templars was perpetual imprisonment in monasteries.² They seem to have been followed by general respect.

In Scotland the Inquisition was conducted by the Bishop of St. Andrews and John de Solerco, Scotland. Dec. 15, 1309. one of the Pope's clerks. The interrogatories of only two Knights appear: but many monks and clergy were examined, who seem to have been extremely jealous of what they branded as the lawless avarice and boundless wealth of the Templars.³

In Ireland thirty Brothers of the Order were interrogated in the church of St. Patrick; one only, a chaplain, admitted even suspicions against the Order. Other witnesses were then examined, chiefly Franciscans, who in Ireland seem to have been actuated by a bitter hatred of the Templars. All of them swore

¹ "Diffamati."

² "Quod singuli in singulis monasteriis possessionatis detruderentur, pro perpetuâ pœnitentiâ peragendâ, qui postea in hujusmodi monasteriis bene per omnia se gerebant." — Thos. Walsingham.

³ A monk of Newbottle complains of their "conquestus injustos. Indifferenter sibi appropriare cupiunt per fas et nefas, bona et prædia suorum vicinorum." Compare Addison, p. 486.

that they suspected and believed the guilt of the Order, but no one deposed to any fact, except that in the celebration of the Mass, certain Templars would not look up, but kept their eyes fixed on the ground. Some two or three discharged servants told all sorts of rumors against the Order, "that refractory Brethren were sewed up in sacks and cast into the sea." It was often said that whenever a Chapter was held, one of the number was always missing. Everything that the Grand Master ordered was obeyed throughout the world.¹

In Italy, wherever the influence of France and the authority of the Pope strongly predominated, *Italy*. confessions were obtained. In Naples, Charles of Anjou, Philip's cousin, had already arrested the whole Order, as in his dominions in Provence, Forcalquier, and Piedmont.² The house of Anjou had to wreak their long-hoarded vengeance on the Templars for the aid they had afforded to the Arragonese, Frederick of Sicily. The servitor Frank Ranyaris described an idol kept in a coffer, and shown to him by the Preceptor of Bari. Andrew, a servitor, had been compelled to deny Christ, and to other enormities; had seen an idol with three heads, which was worshipped as their God and their Redeemer: he it was who bestowed on them their boundless wealth. The Archbishop of Brindisi heard from two confessions of the denial of Christ. Six were heard in Arragonese Sicily, who made some

¹ The report is in Wilkins, *Concilia*.

² The proceedings in Beaucaire, Alais, and Nismes, are, according to Wilcke, in the Vatican (see above). At Lucerne (?), a brother admitted in Spain boldly averred that the Pope himself had avowed his belief that Jesus was not God, that he suffered not for the redemption of man, but from hatred of the Jews. — Wilcke, from MS., p. 337.

admissions. Thirty-two in Messina resolutely denied all.¹

In the Papal States the examinations lasted from December, 1309, to July, 1310, at Viterbo, before the Bishop of Sutri. The worship of idols was acknowledged by several witnesses.² At Florence, and before a Provincial Council held by the Archbishop of Pisa and the Bishop of Florence, some Knights admitted the guilt of the Order. But Reginald, Archbishop of Ravenna, had a commission of inquiry over Lombardy, the March of Ancona, Tuscany, and Dalmatia. At Ravenna the Dominicans proposed to apply torture: the majority of the Council rejected the proposition. Seven Templars³ maintained the innocence of the Order; they were absolved; and in the Council the Churchmen declared that those who retracted confessions made under torture were to be held guiltless.⁴ The Archbishop of Ravenna and the Bishop of Rimini held an inquest at Cesena. Andrew of Sienna declared that he had heard that many Brothers had confessed from fear of torture. He knew nothing, had heard nothing of such things; had he known them, he would have left the Order, and denounced it to the Bishops and Inquisitors. "I had rather have been a beggar for my bread than remain with such men. I had rather died, for above all things is to be preferred the salvation of the soul."

¹ Wilcke, Haveman. ?

² The particulars in Raynouard, p. 271.

³ The names in Raynouard, p. 277.

⁴ "Communi sententiâ decretum est innocentes absolvi. . . . Intelligi innocentes debere qui, metu tormentorum, confessi fuissent, si deinde eam confessionem revocassent; aut revocare, hujusmodi tormentorum metu, ne inferrentur nova, non fuissent ausi, dum tamen id constaret." — Harduin, Concil. 7, p. 1317. All this implies the general use of torture in Italy.

From Lombardy there are no reports.¹ In the island of Cyprus an inquest was held:² one hundred and ten witnesses were heard, seventy-five of the Order. They had at one time taken up arms to defend themselves, but laid them down in obedience to the law. All maintained the blamelessness of the Order with courage and dignity.

In Spain the acquittal of the Order in each of the kingdoms was solemn, general, complete.³ In Spain.

Aragon, on the first alarm of an arrest of the Order, the Knights took to their mountain-fortresses, manned them, and seemed determined to stand on their defence. They soon submitted to the King and the laws. The Grand Inquisitor, D. Juan Lotger, a Dominican, conducted the interrogatories with stern severity; the torture was used. A Council was assembled at Tarragona, on which sat the Archbishop, Guillen da Rocaberti, with his suffragans. The Templars were declared innocent; above all suspicion.⁴ "No one was to dare from that time to defame them." Other interrogatories took place in Medina del Campo, Medina Celi, and in Lisbon. The Council of Salamanca, presided over by the Archbishop of Santiago, the Bishop of Lisbon, and some other prelates, having made diligent investigation of the truth, declared the Templars of Castile, Leon, and Portugal free from all the charges imputed against

¹ There were one or two unimportant inquiries at Bologna, Fano, &c. — Raynouard.

² May and June, 1311.

³ See Zurita Anales, Campomanes.

⁴ "Neque enim tam culpabiles inventi fuerunt, ac fama ferebat, quamvis tormentis adacti fuissent ad confessionem criminum." — Mansi, Concil. sub ann.

them,¹ reserving the final judgment for the Supreme Pontiff.

In Germany Peter Ashpalter, Archbishop of Mentz, A.D. 1310. summoned a Synod in obedience to the Pope's Bull issued to the Archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, Treves, and Magdeburg. The Council was seated, the Primate and his brother prelates. Suddenly Hugh, Wild and Rheingraf, the Preceptor of the Order at Grumbach near Meissenheim, entered the hall with his Knights in full armor and in the habit of the Order. The Archbishop calmly demanded their business. In a loud clear voice Hugh replied, that he and his Brethren understood that the Council was assembled, under a commission from the Roman Pontiff, for the abolition of the Order; that enormous crimes and more than heathen wickednesses were charged against them; they had been condemned without legal hearing or conviction. "Wherefore before the Holy Fathers present he appealed to a future Pope and to his whole clergy; and entered his public protest that those who had been delivered up and burned had constantly denied those crimes, and on that denial had suffered tortures and death: that God had avouched their innocence by a wonderful miracle, their white mantles marked with the red-cross had been exposed to fire and would not burn.² The Archbishop, fearing lest a tumult should arise, accepted the protest, and dismissed them with courtesy. A year afterwards a Council at Mentz, having heard thirty-eight witnesses, declared the Order

¹ "Y si mandò, que nadie se atraviase a infamarlos por quanto en la averiguacion hecha por el concilio fueron hallados libros di toda mala suspuesta."—Campomanes, Dissert. vii.

² Serrarius, Res Moguntiacæ. — Mansi, vol. xxv. p. 297.

guiltless. A Council held by the Archbishop of Treves came to the same determination. Burchard, Archbishop of Magdeburg, a violent and unjust man, attempted to arrest the Templars of the North of Germany. He was compelled to release them. They defended the fortress of Beyer Naumbourg against the Archbishop. Public favor appears to have been on their side: no condemnation took place.

Christian history has few problems more perplexing, yet more characteristic of the age, than the *The problem.* guilt or innocence of the Templars. Two powerful interests have conspired in later times against them. The great legists of monarchical France, during a *The lawyers.* period of vast learning, thought it treason against the monarchy to suppose that, even in times so remote, an ancestor of Louis XIV. could have been guilty of such atrocious iniquity as the unjust condemnation of the Templars. The whole archives were entirely in the power of these legists. The documents were published with laborious erudition; but throughout, both in the affair of the Templars and in the strife with Boniface VIII. and in the prosecution of his memory, with a manifest, almost an avowed, bias towards the King of France. The honor, too, of the legal profession seemed involved in these questions. The distinguished ancestors of the great modern lawyers, the De Flottes, De Plasians, and the Nogarets, who raised the profession to be the predominant power in the state, and set it on equal terms with the hierarchy — the founders almost of the parliaments of France — must not suffer attainder, or be degraded into the servile counsellors of proceedings which violated every principle of law and of justice.

On the other hand the ecclesiastical writers, who es-

teem every reproach against the Pope as an insult to, or a weakening of their religion, would rescue Clement V. from the guilt of the unjust persecution, spoliation, abolition of an Order to which Christendom owed so deep a debt of honor and of gratitude. Papal infallibility, to those who hold it in its highest sense, or Papal impeccability, in which they would fondly array, as far as possible, each hallowed successor of St. Peter, is endangered by the weakness, if not worse than weakness, of the Holy Father. But the calmer survey of the whole reign of Philip the Fair, of his character and that of his counsellors — of his measures and his necessities — of his unscrupulous ambition, avarice, fraud, violence — of the other precedents of his oppression — at least throws no improbability on the most discreditable version of this affair. Clement V., inextricably fettered by the compact through which he bought the tiara, still in the realm or within the power of Philip, with no religious, no moral strength in his personal character, had, as Pope, at least one, if not more than one object — the eluding or avoiding the condemnation of Pope Boniface, to which must be sacrificed every other right or claim to justice. The Papal authority was absolutely on the hazard; the condemnation of Boniface would crumble away its very base. A great Italian Pope might have beheld in the military Orders, now almost discharged from their functions in the East, a power which might immeasurably strengthen the See of Rome. They might become a feudal militia, of vast wealth and possessions, holding directly of himself, if skilfully managed, at his command, in every kingdom in Christendom. With this armed aristocracy, with the Friar

The ecclesiastics.

Preachers to rule the middle or more intellectual classes, the Friar Minors to keep alive and govern the fanaticism of the lowest, what could limit or control his puissance? But a French Pope, a Pope in the position of Clement, had no such splendid visions of supremacy; what he held, he held almost on sufferance; he could maintain himself by dexterity and address alone, not by intrepid assertion of authority. Nor was it difficult to abuse himself into a belief or a supposed belief in the guilt of the Templars. He had but to accept without too severe examination the evidence heaped before him; to authorize as he did—and in so doing he introduced nothing new, startling, or contrary to the usage of the Church—the terrible means, of which few doubted the justice, used to extort that evidence. The iniquity, the cruelty was all the King's; his only responsible act at last was in the mildest form the abolition of an Order which had ceased to fulfil the aim for which it was founded; and by taking this upon himself, he retained the power of quietly thwarting the avarice of the King, and preventing the escheat of all the possessions of the Order to the Crown.

Our history has shown the full value of the evidence against the Order. Beyond the confessions Evidence. of the Templars themselves there was absolutely nothing but the wildest, most vague, most incredible tales of superstition and hatred. In France alone, and where French influence prevailed, were confessions obtained. Elsewhere, in Spain, in Germany, parts of Italy, there was an absolute acquittal; in England, Scotland, and Ireland there appears no evidence which in the present day would commit a thief, or condemn him to transportation. In France these confessions

were invariably, without exception, crushed out of men imprisoned, starved, disgraced, under the most relentless tortures, or under well-grounded apprehensions of torture, degradation, and misery, with, on the other hand, promises of absolution, freedom, pardon, royal favor. Yet on the instant that they struggle again into the light of day ; on the first impulse of freedom and hope ; no sooner do they see themselves for a moment out of the grasp of the remorseless King ; under the judgment, it might be, of the less remorseless Church, than all these confessions are for the most part retracted, retracted fully, unequivocally. This retractation was held so fatal to the cause of their enemies that all the bravest were burned and submitted to be burned rather than again admit their guilt. The only points on which there was any great extent or unanimity of confession were the ceremonies at the reception, the abnegation of Christ, the insult to the Cross, with the other profane or obscene circumstances. These were the points on which it was the manifest object of the prosecutors to extort confessions which were suggested by the hard, stern questions, the admission of which mostly satisfied the Court.

Admit to the utmost that the devout and passionate enthusiasm of the Templars had died away, that familiarity with other forms of belief in the East had deadened the fanatic zeal for Christ and his Sepulchre ; that Oriental superstitions, the belief in magic, talismans, amulets, had crept into many minds ; that in not a few the austere morals had yielded to the wild life, the fiery sun, the vices of the East ; that the corporate spirit of the Order, its power, its wealth, its pride, had absorbed the religious spirit of the first Knights : yet there is

something utterly inconceivable in the general, almost universal, requisition of a naked, ostentatious, offensive, insulting renunciation of the Christian faith, a renunciation following immediately on the most solemn vow ; not after a long, slow initiation into the Order, not as the secret, esoteric doctrine of the chosen few, but on the threshold of the Order, on the very day of reception. It must be supposed, too, that this should not have transpired ; that it should not have been indig- nantly rejected by many of noble birth and brave minds ; or that all who did dare to reject it should have been secretly made away with, or overawed by the terror of death, or the solemnity of their vow of obe- dience ; that there should have been hardly any pru- dential attempts at concealment, full liberty of con- fession, actual confession, it should seem, to bishops, priests, and friars ; and yet that it should not have got abroad, except perhaps in loose rumors, in suspicions, which may have been adroitly instilled into the popular mind : that nothing should have been made known till denounced by the two or three renegades produced by William of Nogaret.

The early confession of Du Molay, his retractation of his retractation, are facts no doubt embarrassing, yet at the same time very obscure. But the genuine chiv- alrous tone of the language in which he asserted that the confession had been tampered with, or worse ; the care manifestly taken that his confession should not be made in the presence of the Pope, the means no doubt used, the terror of torture, or actual degrading, agoniz- ing torture, to incapacitate him from appearing at Poi- tiers : — these and many other considerations greatly lighten or remove this difficulty. His death, hereafter

to be told, which can hardly be attributed but to vengeance for his having arraigned, or fear lest he should with too great authority arraign the whole proceedings, with all the horrible circumstances of that death, confirms this view.

Du Molay was a man of brave and generous impulses, but not of firm and resolute character; he was unsuited for his post in such perilous times. That post required not only the most intrepid mind, but a mind which could calculate with sagacious discrimination the most prudent as well as the boldest course. On him rested the fame, the fate, of his Order; the freedom, the exemption from torture or from shame, of each single brother, his companions in arms, his familiar friends. And this man was environed by the subtlest of foes. When he unexpectedly breaks out into a bold and appalling disclosure, De Plasian is at hand to soften by persuasion, to perplex with argument, to bow by cruel force. His generous nature may neither have comprehended the arts of his enemies, nor the full significance, the sense which might be drawn from his words. He may have been tempted to some admissions, in the hope not of saving himself but his Order; he may have thought by some sacrifice to appease the King or to propitiate the Pope. The secrets of his prison-house were never known. All he said was noted down and published, and reported to the Pope; all he refused to say (except that one speech before the Papal Commissioners) suppressed. He may have had a vague trust in the tardy justice of the Pope, when out of the King's power, and lulled himself with this precarious hope. Nor can we quite assume that he was not the victim of absolute and groundless forgery.

All contemporary history, and that history which is nearest the times, except for the most part ^{Contemporary history.} the French biographers of Pope Clement, denounce in plain unequivocal terms the avarice of Philip the Fair as the sole cause of the unrighteous condemnation of the Templars. Villani emphatically pronounces that the charges of heresy were advanced in order to seize their treasures, and from secret jealousy of the Grand Master. "The Pope abandoned the Order to the King of France, that he might avert, if possible, the condemnation of Boniface."¹ Zantfliet, Canon of Liege, describes the noble martyrdom of the Templars, that of Du Molay from the report of an eye-witness: "had not their death tended to gratify his insatiate appetite for their wealth, their noble demeanor had triumphed over the perfidy of the avaricious King."² The Cardinal Antonino of Florence, a Saint, though he adopts in fact almost the words of Villani, is even more plain and positive: — "The whole was forged by the avarice of the King, that he might despoil the Templars of their wealth."³

¹ "Mosso da avarizia si fece promettere dal Papa secretamente di disfare ladetta Ordine de Templari . . . ma più si dice che fu per trarre di loro molta moneta, e per isdegno preso col maestro del tempio, e colla magione. Il Papa per levarsi da dosso il Re di Francia, per contentarlo per la richiesta di condannare Papa Bonifazio." — l. viii. c. 92.

² "Dicens eos tam perversâ animi fortitudine regis avari vicisse perfidiam, nisi moriendo illuc tedendissent, quo ejus appetitus inexplibilis cupiebat: quamquam non minor idcirco gloria fuerit, si recto præligentes judicio, inter tormenta maluerint deficere, quam adversus veritatem dixisse aut famam justè quæsitam turpissimi sceleris confessione maculare." He describes Du Molay's death (see further on), "rege spectante," and adds, "qui hæc vidit scriptori testimonium præbuit." — Zantfliet. *Chronic.* apud Martene. Zantfliet's *Chronicle* was confined to 1460. — *Collect. Nov.* v. 5.

³ "Totum tamen falsè conficturi ex avaritiâ, ut illi religiosi Templarii

Yet the avarice of Philip was baffled, at least as to the full harvest it hoped to reap. The absolute confiscation of all the estates of a religious Order bordered too nearly on invasion of the property of the Church; the lands and treasures were dedicated inalienably to pious uses, specially to the conquest of the Holy Land. The King had early been forced to consent to make over the custody of the lands to the Bishops of the diocese; careful inventories too were to be made of all their goods, for which the King's officers were responsible. But of the movables of which the King had taken possession, it may be doubted if much, or any part, was allowed to escape his iron grasp, or whether any account was ever given of the vast treasures accumulated in the vaults, in the chapels, in the armories, in the storehouses of the Temple castles. The lands indeed, both in England and in France, were at length made over to the Hospitallers; yet, according to Villani,¹ they were so burdened by the demands, dilapidations, and exactions of the King's officers, they had to purchase the surrender from the King and other princes at such vast cost of money, raised at such exorbitant interest, that the Order of St. John was poorer rather than richer from what seemed so splendid a grant. The Crown claimed enormous sums as due on the sequestration. Some years later Pope John XXII. complains that the King's officers seized

exspoliarentur bonis suis." — St. Antonin. Archiep. Florent. Hist. He wrote about A.D. 1450.

¹ "Ma convenneli loro ricogliere e ricomperare dal Re di Francia e dalli altri principi è Signori con tanta quantità di moneta, che con gli interessi corsi poi, la magione dello Spedale fu e è in più povertà, che prima avendo solo il suo proprio." Villani is good authority in money matters.

the estates of the Hospitallers as an indemnity for claims which had arisen during the confiscation.¹

The dissolution of the Order was finally determined. "If," said the Pope, "it cannot be destroyed by the way of justice, let it be destroyed by the way of expediency, lest we offend our dear son the King of France."² The Council of Vienne was to pronounce the solemn act of dissolution. Of the Templars the few who had been absolved, and had not retracted their confession, were permitted to enter into other orders, or to retire into monasteries. Many had thrown off the habit of the Order, and in remote parts fell back to secular employments: many remained in prison. Du Molay and the three other heads of the Order were reserved in close custody for a terrible fate, hereafter to be told.^{3 4}

¹ Dupuy, Condemnation.

² "Et sicut audiavi ab uno, qui fuit *examinator causæ et testium*, destructus fuit contra justitiam, et mihi dixit, quod ipse Clemens protulit hoc, 'Et si non per viam justitiæ potest destrui, destruat tamen per viam expediendi, ne scandalizetur charus filius noster Rex Franciæ.' " — Alberici de Rosate Bergomensis, *Dictionarium Juris*: Venetiis, 1579, folio; sub voce *Templarii*, quoted by Haveman, p. 381.

³ Wilcke asserts (p. 342) that Moldenhauer's publication of the Proceedings against the Templars (now more accurately and fully edited by M. Michelet) was bought up by the Freemasons as injurious to the fame of the Templars. If this was so, the Freemasons committed an error: my doubts of their guilt are strongly confirmed by the Procès. Wilcke makes three regular gradations of initiation: I. The denial of Christ; II. The kisses; III. The worship of the Idol. This is contrary to all the evidence; the two first are always described as simultaneous. Wilcke has supposed that so long as the Order consisted only of knights, it was orthodox. The clerks introduced into the Order, chiefly Friar Minorites, brought in learning and the wild speculative opinions. But for this he alleges not the least proof.

⁴ A modern school of history, somewhat too prone to make or to imagine discoveries, has condemned the Templars upon other grounds. These fierce unlettered warriors have risen into Oriental mystics. Not merely has their intercourse with the East softened off their abhorrence of Mohammedanism, induced a more liberal tone of thought, or overlaid their West-

ern superstitions with a layer of Oriental imagery — they have become Gnostic Theists, have adopted many of the old Gnostic charms, amulets, and allegorical idols. Under these influences they had framed a secret body of statutes, communicated only to the initiate, who were slowly and after long probation admitted into the abstruser and more awful mysteries. Not only this, the very branch of the Gnostics has been indicated, that of the Ophitæ, of whom they are declared to be the legitimate Western descendants. If they have thus had precursors, neither have they wanted successors. The Templars are the ancestors (as Wilcke thought, the acknowledged ancestors) of the secret societies, which have subsisted by regular tradition down to modern times — the Freemasons, Illuminati, and many others. It is surprising on what loose, vague evidence rests the whole of this theory: on amulets, rings, images, of which there is no proof whatever that they belonged to the Templars, or if they did, that they were not accidentally picked up by individuals in the East; on casual expressions of worthless witnesses, *e. g.*, Staplebridge the English renegade; on certain vessels, or bowls converted into vessels, used in an imaginary Fire-Baptism, deduced, without any regard to gaps of centuries in the tradition, from ancient heretics, and strangely mingled up with the Sangreal of mediæval romance. M. von Hammer has brought great Oriental erudition, but, I must say, not much Western logic, to bear on the question; he has been thoroughly refuted, as I think, by M. Raynouard and others. Another cognate ground is the discovery of certain symbols, and those symbols interpreted into obscene significations, on the churches of the Templars. But the same authorities show that these symbols were by no means peculiar to the Temple churches. No doubt among the monks there were foul imaginations, and in a coarse age architects — many of them monks — gratified those foul imaginations by such unseemly ornaments. But the argument assumes the connection or identification of the architects with the secret guild of Freemasonry (in which guild I do not believe), and also of the Freemasons with the Templars, which is totally destitute of proof. It appears to me absolutely monstrous to conclude that when all the edifices, the churches, the mansions, the castles, the farms, the granaries of the Templars in France and England, in every country of Europe, came into the possession of their sworn enemies; when these symbols, in a state far more perfect, must have stared them in the face; when the lawyers were on the track for evidence; when vague rumors had set all their persecutors on the scent; when Philip and the Pope would have paid any price for a single idol, and not one could be produced: because in our own days, among the thousand misshapen and grotesque sculptures, gargoyles, and corbels, here and there may be discerned or made out something like a black cat, or some other shape, said to have been those of Templar idols, — therefore the guilt of the Order, and their lineal descent from ancient heretics, should be assumed as history. Yet on such grounds the Orientalization of the whole Order, not here and there of a single renegade, has been drawn with complacent satisfaction. The great stress of all, however,

is laid on the worship of Baphomet. The talismans, bowls, symbols, are even called Baphometric. Now, with M. Raynouard, I have not the least doubt that Baphomet is no more than a transformation of the name of Mahomet. Here is only one passage from the Provençal poetry. It is from a Poem by the Chevalier du Temple, quoted Hist. Littér. de la France, xix. p. 345:

“Quar Dieux dorm, qui veillar solea,
E *Bafomet* obra de son poder,
E fai obra di Melicadeser.”

“God, who used to watch (during the Crusades), now slumbers, and Bafomet (Mahomet) works as he wills to complete the triumph of the Sultan.” I am not surprised to find fanciful writers like M. Michelet, who write for effect, and whose positiveness seems to me not seldom in the inverse ratio to the strength of his authorities, adopting such wild notions; but even the clear intellect of Mr. Hallam appears to me to attribute more weight than I should have expected to this theory. — Note to Middle Ages, vol. iii. p. 50. It appears to me, I confess, that so much learning was never wasted on a fantastic hypothesis as by M. von Hammer in his *Mysterium Baphometis Revelatum*. The statutes of the Order were published in 1840 by M. Maillard de Chambure. They contain nothing but what is pious and austere. This, as Mr. Hallam observes, is of course, and proves nothing. M. de Chambure says that it is acknowledged in Germany that M. von Hammer's theory is an idle chimera.

CHAPTER III.

ARRAIGNMENT OF BONIFACE. COUNCIL OF VIENNE.

Prosecution
of the mem-
ory of Pope
Boniface
 IF, however, Pope Clement hoped to appease or to divert the immitigable hatred of Philip and his ministers from the persecution of the memory of Pope Boniface by the sacrifice of the Templars, or at least to gain precious time which might be pregnant with new events, he was doomed to disappointment. The hounds were not thrown off their track, not even arrested in their course, by that alluring quarry. That dispute was still going on simultaneously with the affair of the Templars. Philip, at every fresh hesitation of the Pope, broke out into more threatening indignation. Nogaret and the lawyers presented memorial on memorial, specifying with still greater distinctness and particularity the offences which they declared themselves ready to prove. They complained, not without justice, that the most material witnesses might be cut off by death ; that every year of delay weakened their power of producing attestations to the validity of their charges.¹

The hopes indeed held out to the King's avarice and revenge by the abandonment of the Templars ; hopes,

¹ All the documents are in Dupuy, *Preuves*, p. 367 *et seq.*, with Baillet's smaller volume.

if not baffled, eluded, were more than counterbalanced by his failure in obtaining the Empire for Charles of Valois. An act of enmity sank deeper into the proud heart of Philip than an act of favor: the favor had been granted grudgingly, reluctantly, with difficulty, with reservation; the enmity had been subtle, perfidious, under the guise of friendship.

Pope Clement had now secured, as he might fondly suppose, his retreat in Avignon, in some degree beyond the King's power. In France he dared not stay; to Italy he could not and would not go. The King's messengers were in Avignon to remind him that he had pledged himself to hear and examine the witnesses against the memory of Boniface. Not the King's messengers alone. Reginald di Supino had been most deeply implicated in the affair of An-^{Reginald di Supino.}agni. He had assembled a great body of witnesses, as he averred, to undergo the expected examination before the Pope. Either the Pope himself, or the friends of Boniface, who had still greater power, and seemed determined, from attachment to their kinsman or from reverence for the Popedom, to hazard all in his defence, dreaded this formidable levy of witnesses, whom Reginald di Supino would hardly have headed unless in arms. Supino had arrived within three leagues of Avignon when he received intelligence from the King's emissaries of an ambuscade of the partisans of Boniface, stronger than his own troop: he would not risk the attack, but retired to Nismes, and there, in the presence of the municipal authorities, entered a public protest against those who prevented him and his witnesses, by the fear of death, from approaching the presence of the Pope. The Pope himself was not distinctly

charged with, but not acquitted of complicity in this deliberate plot to arrest the course of justice.¹

Clement was in a strait: he was not in the domin-
Difficulties of the Pope. ions, but yet not absolutely safe from the power of Philip. Charles, King of Naples, Philip's kinsman, as Count of Provence, held the adjacent country. The King of France had demanded a Council to decide this grave question. The Council had been summoned and adjourned by Clement. But a Pope, though a dead Pope, arraigned before a Council, all the witnesses examined publicly, in open Court, to proclaim to Christendom the crimes imputed to Boniface! Where, if the Council should assume the power of condemning a dead Pope, would be the security of a living one? Clement wrote, not to Philip, but to Charles of Valois, representing the toils and anxieties which he was enduring, the laborious days and sleepless nights, in the investigation of the affair of Boniface. He entreated that the judgment might be left altogether to himself and the Church. He implored the intercession of Charles with the King, of Charles whom he had just thwarted in his aspiring views on the Empire.²

But the King was not to be deterred by soft words. He wrote more peremptorily, more imperiously. "Some witnesses, men of the highest weight and above all exception, had already died in the Court of Rome and elsewhere: the Pope retarded the safe conduct necessary for the appearance of other witnesses, who had been seized, tortured, put to death, by the partisans of

¹ "Recesserunt propterea predicti, qui cum dicto domino Raynaldo venerant, ad propria redeuntes, mortis merito periculum formidantes." — *Preuves*, p. 289.

² *Preuves*, p. 290. May 23, 1309.

Boniface.” The Pope replied in a humble tone:—
 “Never was so weighty a process so far advanced in so short a time. Only one witness had died, and his deposition had been received on his death-bed. He denied the seizure, torture, death, of any witnesses. One of these very witnesses, a monk, it was confidently reported, was in France with William de Nogaret.” He complained of certain letters forged in his name—a new proof of the daring extent to which at this time such forgeries were carried. In those letters the names of Cardinals, both of the King’s party and on that of Boniface, had been audaciously inserted. These letters had been condemned and burned in the public consistory. The Pope turns to another affair. Philip, presuming on the servility of the Pope, had introduced a clause into the treaty with the Flemings, that if they broke the treaty they should be excommunicated, and not receive absolution without the consent of the King or his successors. The Pope replies, “that he cannot abdicate for himself or future Popes the full and sole power of granting absolution. If the King, as he asserts, can adduce any precedent for such clause, he would consent to that, or even a stronger one; but he has taken care that the Flemings are not apprised of his objection to the clause.”¹

Clement was determined, as far as a mind like his was capable of determination, to reserve the inevitable judgment on the memory of Boni-<sup>Determina-
tion of Clem-
ent.</sup>face to himself and his own Court, and not to recognize the dangerous tribunal of a Council, fatal to living as to dead pontiffs. He issued a Bull,² summoning Philip

¹ Preuves, p. 292. August 23, 1309.

² Sept. 1309. Raynaldus sub ann. c. 4.

King of France, his three sons, with the Counts of Evreux, St. Pol, and Dreux, and William de Plasian, according to their own petition, to prove their charges against Pope Boniface; to appear before him in Avignon Feb. 2, 1310. non on the first court-day after the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin. The Bishop of Paris was ordered to serve this citation on the three Counts and on William de Plasian.¹

Philip seemed to be embarrassed by this measure. He shrunk or thought it beneath his dignity for himself or his sons to stand as public prosecutors before the Papal Court. Instead of the King appeared a haughty letter. "He had been compelled reluctantly to take cognizance of the usurpation and wicked life of Pope Boniface. Public fame, the representations of men of high esteem in the realm, nobles, prelates, doctors, had arraigned Boniface as a heretic, and an intruder into the fold of the Lord. A Parliament of his whole kingdom had demanded that, as the champion and defender of the faith, he should summon a General Council, before which men of the highest character declared themselves ready to prove these most appalling charges. William de Nogaret had been sent to summon Pope Boniface to appear before that Council. The Pope's frantic resistance had led to acts of violence, not on the part of Nogaret, but of the Pope's subjects, by whom he was universally hated. These charges had been renewed after the death of Boniface, before Benedict XI. and before the present Pope. The Pope, in other affairs, especially that of the Templars, had shown his regard for justice. All these things were to be finally determined

The King
will not
appear as
prosecutor.

¹ Raynaldus ut supra. Oct. 18.

at the approaching Council. But if the Pope, solicitous to avoid before the Council the odious intricacies of charges, examinations, investigations, in the affair of Boniface, desired to determine it by the plenitude of the Apostolic authority, he left it entirely to the judgment of the Pope, whether in the Council or elsewhere. He was prepared to submit the whole to the Feb. 14. disposition and ordinance of the Holy See." The King's sons, summoned in like manner to undertake the office of prosecutors, declined to appear in that somewhat humiliating character.¹

William de Nogaret and William de Plasian remained the sole prosecutors in this great De Plasian and De Nogaret. cause, and they entered upon it with a profound and accumulated hatred to Boniface and to his memory : De Plasian with the desperate resolution of a man so far committed in the strife that either Boniface must be condemned, or himself held an impious, false accuser ; Nogaret with the conviction that Boniface must be pronounced a monster of iniquity, or himself hardly less than a sacrilegious assassin. With both, the dignity and honor of their profession were engaged in a bold collision with the hierarchical power which had ruled the human mind for centuries ; both had high, it might be conscientious, notions of the monarchical authority, its independence, its superiority to the sacerdotal ; both were bound by an avowed and resolute servility, which almost rose to noble attachment, to their King and to France. The King of France, if any Sovereign, was to be exempt from Papal tyranny, and hatred to France was one of the worst crimes of Boniface. Both, unless Boniface was really the infidel,

¹ Preuves, p. 301.

heretic, abandoned profligate, which they represented him, were guilty of using unscrupulously, of forging, suborning, a mass of evidence and a host of witnesses, of which they could not but know the larger part to be audaciously and absolutely false.

On the other side appeared the two nephews of *Italians*. Boniface and from six to ten Italian doctors of law, chosen no doubt for their consummate science and ability; as canon lawyers confronting civil lawyers with professional rivalry, and prepared to maintain the most extravagant pretensions of the Decretals as the Statute Law of the Church. They could not but be fully aware how much the awe, the reverence, and the power of the Papacy depended on the decision; they were men, it might be, full of devout admiration even of the overweening haughtiness of Boniface; churchmen, in whom the intrepid maintenance of what were held to be Church principles more than compensated for all the lowlier and gentler virtues of the Gospel.¹ It was a strange trial, the arraignment of a dead Pope, a Rhadamanthine judgment on him who was now before a higher tribunal.

On the 16th of March the Pope solemnly opened the Consistory at Avignon, in the palace belonging to the Dominicans, surrounded by his Cardinals and a great multitude of the clergy and laity. The Pope's Bull was read, in which, after great commendation of the faith and zeal of the King of France, and high testimony to the fame of Boni-

¹ "Gotius de Arimino utriusque juris, Baldredus Beyeth *Decretorum Doctores*" Baldred, who took the lead in the defence, is described as Glascuensis.

face, he declared that heresy was so execrable, so horrible an offence, that he could not permit such a charge to rest unexamined. The French lawyers were admitted as prosecutors.¹ The Italians protested against their admission.² On Friday (March 20th) the Court opened the session. The prosecutors put in a protest of immeasurable length, declaring that they did not appear in consequence of the Pope's citation of the King of France and his sons. That citation was informal, illegal, based on false grounds. They demanded that the witnesses who were old and sick should be first heard. They challenged certain Cardinals, the greater number (they would not name them publicly), as having a direct interest in the judgment, as attached by kindred or favor to Boniface, as notoriously hostile, as having entered into plots against William de Nogaret, as having prejudiced the mind of Benedict XI. against him. Nogaret, who always reverted to the affair of Anagni, asserted that act to have been the act of a true Catholic, one of devout, filial love, not of hatred, the charity of one who would bind a maniac or rouse a man in a lethargy.³ He had made common cause with the nobles of Anagni, all but those who plundered the Papal treasures.

On the 27th De Nogaret appeared again, and en-

¹ Adam de Lombal, Clerk, and Peter de Galahaud, and Peter de Bleonasio, the King's nuncios (nuntii), appeared with De Plasian and De Nogaret.

² James of Modena offered himself to prove "*quod prædicti opposcentes ad opponendum contra dictum dominum Bonifacium admitti non debebant.*"

³ "*Non fuit igitur odium sed caritas, non fuit injuria sed pietas, non proditio sed fidelitas, non sacrilegium sed sacri defensio, non parricidium sed filialis devotio ut (et?) fraterna, cum qui furiosum ligat vel lethargicum excitat.*" — p. 386.

tered a protest against Baldred and the rest, as defenders of Pope Boniface, against eight Cardinals, by name, as promoted by Boniface: these men might not bear any part in the cause. Protest was met by protest: a long, wearisome, and subtile altercation ensued. Each tried to repel the other party from the Court. Nothing could be more captious than the arguments of the prosecutors, who took exception against any defence of Boniface. The Italians answered that no one could be brought into Court but by a lawful prosecutor, which Nogaret and De Plasian were not, being notorious enemies, assassins, defamers of the Pope. There was absolutely no cause before the Court. The crimination and recrimination dragged on their weary length. It was the object of De Nogaret to obtain absolution, at least under certain restrictions.¹ This personal affair began to occupy almost as prominent a part as the guilt of Boniface. Months passed in the gladiatorial strife of the lawyers.² Every question was reopened — the legality of Cœlestine's abdication, the election of Boniface, the absolute power of the King of France. Vast erudition was displayed on both sides. Mean-
Witnesses. time the examination of the witnesses had gone on in secret before the Pope or his Commissioners. Of these examinations appear only the re-

¹ In the midst of these disputes arose a curious question, whether William de Nogaret was still under excommunication. It was argued that an excommunicated person, if merely saluted by the Pope, or if the Pope knowingly entered into conversation with him, was thereby absolved. The Pope disclaimed this doctrine, and declared that he had never by such salutation or intercourse with De Nogaret intended to confer that precious privilege. This was to be the rule during his pontificate. He would not, however, issue a Decretal on the subject. — p. 409.

² There is a leap from May 13 to Aug. 3.

ports of twenty-three persons examined in April, of eleven examined before the two Cardinals, Berengario, Bishop of Tusculum, and Nicolas, of St. Eusebio, with Bernard Guido, the Grand Inquisitor of Toulouse. Some of the eleven were reëxaminations of those who had made their depositions in April. In the latter case the witnesses were submitted to what was intended to be severe, but does not seem very skilful, cross-examination. On these attestations, if these were all, posterity is reduced to this perplexing alternative of belief:— Either there was a vast systematic subornation of perjury, which brought together before the Pope and the Cardinals, monks, abbots, canons, men of dignified station, from various parts of Italy: and all these were possessed with a depth of hatred, ingrained into the hearts of men by the acts and demeanor of Boniface, and perhaps a religious horror of his treatment of Pope Cœlestine, which seems to be rankling in the hearts of some; or with a furiousness of Ghibelline hostility, which would recoil from no mendacity, which would not only accept every rumor, but invent words, acts, circumstances, with the most minute particularity and with perpetual appeal to other witnesses present at the same transaction. Nor were these depositions wrung out, like those of the Templars, by torture; they were spontaneous, or, if not absolutely spontaneous, only summoned forth by secret suggestion, by undetected bribery, by untraceable influence: they had all the outward semblance of honest and conscientious zeal for justice.

On the other hand, not only must the Pope's guilt be assumed, but the Pope's utter, absolute, ostentatious

defiance of all prudence, caution, dissimulation, decency. Not only was he a secret, hypocritical unbeliever, and that not in the mysteries of the faith, but in the first principles of all religion ; he was a contemptuous, boastful scoffer, and this on the most public occasions, and on occasions where some respectful concealment would not only have been expedient, but of paramount necessity to his interest or his ambition. The aspirant to the Papacy, the most Papal Pope who ever lived, laughed openly to scorn the groundwork of that Christianity on which rested his title to honor, obedience, power, worship.

The most remarkable of all these depositions is that of seven witnesses in succession, an abbot, three canons, two monks, and others, to a discussion concerning the law of Mohammed. This was in the year of the pontificate of Cœlestine, when, if his enemies are to be believed, Benedetto Gaetani was deeply involved in intrigues to procure the abdication of Cœlestine, and his own elevation to the Papacy. At this time, even if these intrigues were untrue, a man so sagacious and ambitious could not but have been looking forward to his own advancement. Yet at this very instant, it is asseverated, Gaetani, in the presence of at least ten or twelve persons, abbots, canons, monks, declared as his doctrine,¹ that no law was divine, that all were the inventions of men, merely to keep the vulgar in awe by the terrors of eternal punishment. Every law, Christianity among the rest, contained truth and falsehood ; falsehood, because it asserted that God was one and three, which it was fatuous to believe ; falsehood, for it said that a virgin had brought forth, which was impos-

¹ " Quasi per modum doctrinæ."

sible ; falsehood, because it avouched that the Son of God had taken the nature of man, which was ridiculous ; falsehood, because it averred that bread was transubstantiated into the body of Christ, which was untrue. " It is false, because it asserts a future life." " Let God do his worst with me in another life, from which no one has returned but to fantastic people, who say that they have seen and heard all kinds of strange things, even have heard angels singing. So I believe and so I hold, as doth every educated man. The vulgar hold otherwise. We must speak as the vulgar do ; think and believe with the few." Another added to all this, that when the bell rang for the passing of the Host, the future Pope smiled and said, " You had better go and see after your own business, than after such folly." ¹ Three of these witnesses were reheard at the second examination, minutely questioned as to the place of this discussion, the dress, attitude, words of Gaetani : they adhered, with but slight deviation from each other, to their deposition ; whatever its worth, it was unshaken.² These blasphemies, if we are to credit another witness, had been his notorious habit from his youth. The Prior of St. Giles at San Gemino, near Narni, had been at school with him at Todi : he was a dissolute youth, indulged in all carnal vices, in drink and play, blaspheming God and the Virgin. He had heard Boniface, when a Cardinal, disputing with certain masters from Paris about the Resurrection. Cardinal Gaetani maintained that neither soul nor body rose again.³ To this dispute a notary, Oddarelli of Acqua Sparta, gave the same testimony. The two witnesses declared that they had not come to Avignon for the purpose of giv-

¹ Truffas.² Witnesses vii. xiii.³ Witnesses xvii. xviii.

ing this evidence; they had been required to appear before the Court by Bertrand de Roccanegata: they bore testimony neither from persuasion, nor for reward, neither from favor, fear, or hatred.

Two monks of St. Gregory at Rome had complained to the Pope of their Abbot, that he held the same loose and infidel doctrines, neither believed in the Resurrection, nor in the Sacraments of the Church; and denied that carnal sins were sins. They were dismissed contemptuously from the presence of Boniface. "Look at this froward race, that will not believe as their Abbot believes."¹ A monk of St. Paul fared no better with similar denunciations of his Abbot.²

Nicolo Pagano of Sermona, Primicerio of St. John Maggiore at Naples, deposed that Cœlestine, proposing to go from Sermona to Naples, sent Pagano's father Berard (the witness went with him) to invite the Cardinal Gaetani to accompany him. Gaetani contemptuously refused. "Go ye with your Saint, I will be fooled no more." "If any man," said Berard, "ought to be canonized after death, it is Cœlestine." Gaetani replied, "Let God give me the good things of this life: for that which is to come I care not a bean; men have no more souls than beasts." Berard looked aghast. "How many have you ever seen rise again?" Gaetani seemed to delight in mocking (such, at least, was the testimony, intended, no doubt, to revolt to the utmost the public feeling against him) the Blessed Virgin. She is no more a virgin than my mother. I believe not in your "Mariola," "Mariola." He denied the presence of Christ in the Host. "It is mere paste."³

¹ Witnesses i. ii.

² Witness xv.

³ Witnesses xvi. xx. xxii.

Yet even this most appalling improbability was surpassed by the report of another conversation attested by three witnesses, sons of knights of Lucca. The scene took place at the Jubilee, when millions of persons, in devout faith in the religion of Christ, in fear of Hell, or in hope of Paradise, were crowding from all parts of Europe, and offering incense to the majesty, the riches of the world to the avarice, of the Pope. Even then, without provocation, in mere wantonness of unbelief, he had derided all the truths of the Gospel. The ambassadors of two of the great cities of Italy — Lucca and Bologna — were standing before him. The death of a Campanian knight was announced. "He was a bad man," said the pious chaplain, "yet may Jesus Christ receive his soul!" "Fool! to commend him to Christ; he could not help himself, how can he help others? he was no Son of God, but a wise man and a great hypocrite. The knight has had in this life all he will have. Paradise is a joyous life in this world; Hell a sad one." "Have we, then, nothing to do but to enjoy ourselves in this world? Is it no sin to lie with women?" — "No greater sin than to wash one's hands." "And this was said that all present might hear; not in jocoseness, but in serious mood." To this monstrous scene, in these words, three witnesses deposed on oath, and gave the names of the ambassadors — men, no doubt, of rank, and well known, to whom they might thus seem to appeal.¹

The account of a conversation with the famous Roger de Loria was hardly less extraordinary. Of the two witnesses, one was a knight of Palermo, William, son of Peter de Calatagerona. Roger de Loria, hav-

¹ Witnesses xii. xiii.

ing revolted from the house of Arragon, came to Rome to be reconciled to the Pope. Yet at that very time the Pope wantonly mocked and insulted the devout seamen, by laughing to scorn that faith which bowed him at his own feet. De Loria had sent the Pope an offering of rich Sicilian fruits and honey. "See," he said, "what a beautiful land I must have left, abounding in such fruits, and have exposed myself to so great dangers to visit you. Had I died on this holy journey, surely I had been saved." "It might be so, or it might not." "Father, I trust that, if at such a moment I had died, Christ would have had mercy on me." The Pope said, "Christ! he was not the Son of God: he was a man eating and drinking like ourselves: by his preaching he drew many towards him, and died, but rose not again; neither will men rise again." "I," pursued the Pope, "am far mightier than Christ. I can raise up and enrich the lowly and poor; I can bestow kingdoms, and humble and beggar rich and powerful kings." In all the material parts of this conversation the two witnesses agreed: they were rigidly cross-examined as to the place, time, circumstances, persons present, the dress, attitude, gestures of the Pope: they were asked whether the Pope spoke in jest or earnest.¹

The same or other witnesses deposed to as unblushing shamelessness regarding the foulest vices as regarding these awful blasphemies — "What harm is there in simony? what harm in adultery, more than in rubbing one's hands together?" This was his favorite phrase. Then were brought forward men formerly belonging to his household, to swear that they had brought women —

¹ Witness x.

one, first his wife, then his daughter — to his bed. Another bore witness that from his youth Boniface had been addicted to worse, to nameless vices — that he was notoriously so; one or two loathsome facts were avouched.

Besides all this, there were what in those days would perhaps be heard with still deeper horror — magical rites and dealings with the powers of ^{Charges of magic.} darkness. Many witnesses had heard that Benedetto Gaetani, that Pope Boniface, had a ring in which he kept an evil spirit. Brother Berard of Soriano had seen from a window the Cardinal Gaetani, in a garden below, draw a magic circle, and immolate a cock over a fire in an earthen pot. The blood and the flame mingled; a thick smoke arose. The Cardinal sat reading spells from a book, and conjuring up the devils. He then heard a terrible noise and wild voices, “Give us our share.” Gaetani took up the cask, and threw it over the wall — “Take your share.” The Cardinal then left the garden, and shut himself up alone in his most secret chamber, where throughout the night he was heard in deep and earnest conversation, and a voice, the same voice, was heard to answer. This witness deposed likewise to having seen Gaetani worshipping an idol, in which dwelt an evil spirit. This idol was given to him by the famous magician, Theodore of Bologna, and was worshipped as his God.¹

Such was the evidence, the whole evidence which appears (there may have been more) so revolting to the faith, so polluting to the morals, ^{Summary of evidence.} so repulsive to decency, that it cannot be plainly repeated, yet adduced against the successor of St. Peter, the Vicar of Christ. What crimes, even for defama-

¹ Witness xvi.

tion, to charge against a Pope! To all this the Pope and the Consistory were compelled to listen in sullen patience. If true — if with a shadow of truth — how monstrous the state of religion and morals! If absolutely and utterly untrue — if foul, false libels, bought by the gold of the King of France, suborned by the unrelenting hatred, and got up by the legal subtlety of De Nogaret and the rest — what humiliation to the Court of Rome to have heard, received, recorded such wicked aspersions, and to have left them unresented, unpunished! The glaring contradiction in the evidence, that Boniface was at once an atheist and a worshipper of idols, an open scoffer in public and a superstitious dealer in magic in private, is by no means the greatest improbability. Such things have been. The direct and total repugnance of such dauntless, wanton, unprovoked blasphemies, even with the vices charged against Boniface, his unmeasured ambition, consummate craft, indomitable pride, is still more astounding, more utterly bewildering to the belief. But whatever the secret disgust and indignation of Clement, it must be suppressed; however the Cardinals the most attached to the memory of Boniface might murmur and burn with wrath in their hearts, they must content themselves with just eluding, with narrowly averting, his condemnation.

Philip himself, either from weariness, dissatisfaction with his own cause, caprice, or the diversion of his mind to other objects, consented to abandon the persecution of the memory of Boniface, and to leave the judgment to the Pope. On this the gratitude of Clement knows no bounds; the adulation of his Bull on the occasion surpasses

Situation of
Clement.

Philip abandons the persecution.

The Pope's Bull.

belief. Every act of Philip is justified; he is altogether acquitted of all hatred and injustice; his whole conduct is attributed to pious zeal. "The worthy head of that royal house, which had been ever devoted, had ever offered themselves and the realm for the maintenance of the Holy Mother Church of Rome, had been compelled by the reiterated representations of men of character and esteem," to investigate the reports unfavorable to the legitimate election, to the orthodox doctrine, and the life of Pope Boniface. The King's full Parliament had urged him with irresistible unanimity to persist in this course. "We therefore, with our brethren the Cardinals, pronounce and decree that the aforesaid King, having acted, and still acting, at the frequent and repeated instance of these high and grave persons, has been and is exempt from all blame, has been incited by a true, sincere, and just zeal and fervor for the Catholic faith." It was thus acknowledged that there was a strong primary case against Boniface; the appeal to the Council was admitted; every act of violence justified, except the last assault at Anagni, as to which the Pope solemnly acquitted the King of all complicity. The condescension of the King, "the son of benediction and grace,"¹ in at length thus tardily and ungraciously remitting the judgment to the Pope, is ascribed to divine inspiration.² Nor were wanting more substantial marks of the Pope's gratitude. Every Bull prejudicial to the King, to the nobles, and the realm of France (not contained in the sixth book of Decretals), is absolutely cancelled and annulled, ex-

¹ "Tanquam benedictionis et gratiæ filius."

² "Nos itaque mansuetudinem regiam ac expertam in iis devotionis et reverentiæ filialis gratitudinem quas . . . dicto Regi *divinitus credimus inspiratas*."

cept the two called "Unam Sanctam" and "Rem non novam," and these are to be understood in the moderated sense assigned by the present Pontiff. All proceedings for forfeiture of privileges, suspension, excommunication, interdict, all deprivations or deposals against the King, his brothers, subjects, or kingdom; all proceedings against the accusers, prosecutors, arraigned in the cause; against the prelates, barons, and commons, on account of any accusation, denunciation, appeal, or petition for the convocation of a General Council; or for blasphemy, insult, injury by deed or word, against the said Boniface, even for his seizure, the assault on his house and person, the plunder of the treasure, or other acts at Anagni; for anything done in behalf of the King during his contest with Boniface: all such proceedings against the living or the dead, against persons of all ranks — cardinals, archbishops, bishops, emperors, or kings, whether instituted by Pope Boniface, or by his successor Benedict, are provisionally¹ annulled, revoked, cancelled. "And if any aspersion, shame, or blame, shall have occurred to any one out of these denunciations, and charges against Boniface, whether during his life or after his death, or any prosecution be hereafter instituted on that account, these we absolutely abolish and declare null and void."²

In order that the memory of these things be utterly extinguished, the proceedings of every kind against France are, under pain of excommunication, to be erased within four months from the capitular books and registers of the Holy See.³ The archives of the Pa-

¹ "Ex cautelâ."

² The Bull dated May, 1311. — Dupuy, Preuves.

³ In Raynaldus (sub ann.) is a full account of the Bulls and passages of Bulls entirely erased for the gratification of King Philip from the Papal

pany are to retain no single procedure injurious to the King of France, or to those, whoever they may be, who are thus amply justified for all their most virulent persecution, for all their contumacious resistance, for the foulest charges, for charges of atheism, simony, whoredom, sodomy, witchcraft, heresy, against the deceased Pope.

Fifteen persons only are exempted from this sweeping amnesty, or more than amnesty; among them William de Nogaret, Reginald Supino and his son, the other insurgents of Anagni, and Sciarra Colonna. These Philip, no doubt by a secret understanding with the Pope, surrendered to the mockery of punishment, punishment which might or might not be enforced. The penance appointed to the rest does not appear; but even William de Nogaret obtained provisional absolution.¹ The Pope, solicitous for the welfare of his soul, and in regard to the pressing supplications of the King, imposed this penance. At the next general Crusade Nogaret should in person set out with arms and horses to the Holy Land, there to serve for life, unless his term of service should be shortened by the mercy of the Pope or his successor. In the mean time, till this general Crusade (never to come to pass), he was to make a pilgrimage to certain shrines and holy places, one at Boulogne-sur-Mer, one at St. James of Compostella.² Such was the sentence on the assailant, almost the assassin, of a Pope; on the persecutor of his memory by the most odious accusations; if those accusations were false, the suborner of the most records; of course they were preserved by the pious care of the partisans of Boniface. See also *Preuves*, p. 606.

¹ "Absolvimus ad cautelam."

² Ptolemy of Lucca calls this "penitentia dura."

Punishment
of William
de Nogaret,
&c.

monstrous system of falsehood, calumny, and perjury. The Pope received one hundred thousand florins from the King's ambassador as a reward for his labors in this cause.¹ This Bull of Clement V.² broke forever the spell of the Pontifical autocracy. A King might appeal to a Council against a Pope, violate his personal sanctity, constitute himself the public prosecutor by himself or by his agents for heresy, for immorality, invent or accredit the most hateful and loathsome charges, all with impunity, all even without substantial censure.

The Council of Vienne met at length; the number of prelates is variously stated from three hundred to one hundred and forty.³ It is said that Bishops were present from Spain, Germany, Denmark, England, Scotland, Ireland, Italy. It assumed the dignity of an Œcumenic Council. The Pope proposed three questions: I. The dissolution of the Order of the Temple; II. The recovery of the Holy Land (the formal object of every later Council, but which had sunk into a form); III. The reformation of manners and of ecclesiastical discipline. The affair of the Templars was the first. It might seem that this whole inquiry had been sifted to the bottom. Yet had the Pope made further preparation for the strong measure determined upon. The orders to the King of Spain to apply tortures for the extortion of confession had been renewed.⁴ The Templars were to

Oct 15 to
Nov. 1, 1311.
Council of
Vienne.

¹ Ptolem. Luc. apud Baluzium, p. 40. "Tunc ambasiatores Regis offerunt cameræ Domini Papæ centum millia florinorum quasi pro quadam re-compensatione laborum circa dictam causam."

² Dated May, 1311.

³ Villani gives the larger number, the continuator of Nangis the smaller. Has the French writer given only the French prelates?

⁴ "Ad eliciendam veritatem religioso fore tortori tradendos." — Letter of Clement to King of Spain, quoted by Raynouard, p. 166.

be secure in no part of Christendom. The same terrible instructions had been sent to the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, to the Bishops of Negropont, Famagosta, and Nicosia.¹ Two thousand depositions had been accumulated, perhaps now slumber in the Vatican. But unexpected difficulties arose. On a sudden nine Templars, who had lurked in safe concealment, perhaps in the valleys of the Jura or the Alps, appeared before the Council, and demanded to be heard in defence of the Order. The Pope was not present. No sooner had he heard of this daring act than he commanded the nine intrepid defenders of their Order to be seized and cast into prison. He wrote in all haste to the King to acquaint him with this untoward interruption.² But embarrassments increased: the acts were read before the Fathers of the Council; all the foreign prelates except one Italian, all the French prelates except three, concurred in the justice of admitting the Order to a hearing and defence before the Council. These three were Peter of Courtenay, Archbishop of Rheims, who had burned the Templars at Senlis: Philip de Marigny of Sens, who had committed the fifty-four Knights to the flames in Paris; the Archbishop of Rouen, the successor of Bertrand de Troyes, who had presided at Pont de l'Arche.³ The Pope

¹ "Ad habendam ab eis veritatis plenitudinem promptiorem tormentis et quæstionibus, si sponte confiteri noluerint, experiri procuretis." — Apud Raynald. 1311, c. liii.

² The letter in Raynouard, p. 177. Raynouard is unfortunately seized with a fit of eloquence, and inserts a long speech which one of the Fathers of the council *ought* to have spoken. The letter is dated Dec. 11.

³ "In hâc sententiâ concordant omnes prælati Italiæ præter unum, Hispaniæ, Theutoniæ, Daniæ, Angliæ, Scotiæ, et Hiberniæ. Item Gallici, præter tres Metropolitanos, videlicet Remensem, Senonensem et Rothomagensensem." — Ptolem. Luc. Vit. II. p. 43. Compare Walsingham. This was in the beginning of December.

was obliged to prorogue the Council for a time. The winter wore away in private discussions.¹ The awe of the King's presence was necessary to strengthen the Pope, and to intimidate the Council. The King had summoned an assembly of the realm at Lyons, now annexed to his kingdom. The avowed object was to secure the triumph of Jesus Christ in the Council.² The Pope took courage; he summoned the prelates on whom he could depend to a secret consistory with the Cardinals. He announced that he had determined, by way of prudent provision,³ not of condemnation, to abolish the Order of Templars: he reserved to himself and to the Church the disposal of their persons and of
A.D. 1312. their estates. On April 3 this act of dissolution was published in the full Council on the absolute and sole authority of the Pope. This famous Order was declared to be extinct; the proclamation was made in the presence of the King⁴ and his brother. We have already described the award of the estates to the Knights of St. John, the impoverishment of that Order⁵ by this splendid boon, or traffic,⁶ as it was called by the enemies of Clement.

Clement, perhaps, had rejoiced in secret at the opposition of the Council to the condemnation of the Templars. It aided him in extorting the price of the important concession from King Philip, the reservation to his own judgment of the sacred and perilous treasure of his predecessor's memory.

¹ Bernard Guido. Vit. III. Clement. Compare IV. et VI.

² Hist. de Languedoc, xxix. c. 33, p. 152.

³ "Per provisiones."

⁴ "Cui negotium erat cordi."

⁵ "Unde depauperata est mansio hospitalis, quæ se existimabat inde opulenta fieri." — S. Antoninus; see above, p. 480.

⁶ "Papa vero statim bona Templi infinito thesauro Fratribus vendidit hospitalis S. Joannis." — Hocsemius, Gest. Pontific. Leoden.

The Council, which had now resumed its sittings, was, not in this point alone, manifestly disinclined to submit to the absolute control of French influence. It asserted its independent dignity in the addresses to which it had listened on the reform of ecclesiastical abuses: it had shown a strong hierarchical spirit. No doubt beyond the sphere of Philip's power, beyond the pale of Ghibelline animosity, beyond that of the lower Franciscans, whose fanatical admiration of Cœlestine had become implacable hatred to Boniface, the prosecution of the Pope's memory was odious. If it rested on any just grounds, it was an irreverent exposure of the nakedness of their common father; if groundless, a wanton and wicked sacrilege. When, therefore, three Cardinals, Richard of Sienna, master of the civil law, John of Namur, as eminent in theology, and Gentili, the most consummate decretalist, appeared in the Council to defend the orthodoxy and holy life of Pope Boniface; when two Catalan Knights threw down their gauntlets, and declared themselves ready to maintain his innocence by wager of battle: Clement interposed not, as in the case of the Templars, any adjournment. He regarded not the confusion of the King and his partisans. The King was therefore obliged to submit to this absolute acquittal, either by positive decree; or, in default of the appearance of any accuser, of any opponent against the theologians or the knights, to accept an edict that no harm or prejudice should accrue to himself or his successors for the part which they had been compelled by duty and by zeal to take against Pope Boniface.¹

Defenders of
Boniface
before the
Council.

¹ The vindication of the fame of Boniface by the Council of Vienne is disputed, F. Pagi, arguing from the fact that the affair was not included in

The Council of Vienne had thus acquiesced in the determination of the first object for which it had been summoned, the suppression of the Templars. The assembly listened with decent outward sympathy to the old wearisome account of the captivity of the Holy Land, and the progress of the Mohammedan arms in the East. But the crusading fire was burnt out; there was hardly a flash or gleam of enthusiasm. It seemed, however, disposed to enter with greater earnestness on the reformation of manners and discipline, and the suppression of certain dangerous dissidents from that discipline. On the former subject the Fathers heard with respectful favor two remarkable addresses. The first was from the Bishop of Mende, one of the assessors at the examination of the Templars; and this address raises the character of that prelate so highly, that his testimony on their condemnation is perhaps the most unfavorable evidence on record against them. The other came from a prelate of great gravity, learning, and piety, whose name has not survived. These addresses, however, which led to no immediate result, may come before us in a general view of the Christianity of this great epoch, the culmination of the Papal power under Boniface VIII., its rapid

the summons, or among the three subjects proposed for the consideration of the Council, that it was not brought before them. Raynaldus relies on the passage of Villani, on which he accumulates much irrelevant matter, without strengthening his cause. The statement in the text appears to me to reconcile all difficulties. It was, throughout, the policy of the Pope to keep this dangerous business entirely in his own hands; this he had extorted with great dexterity and at great sacrifice from the King. Till he knew that he could trust the Council, he had no thought of permitting the Council to interfere (it was an unsafe precedent); but when sure of its temper, he was glad to take the Prelates' judgment in confirmation of his own: he thus at the same time maintained his own sole and superior right of judgment, and backed it, against the King, with the authority of the Council.

decline under the Popes at Avignon. So, too, the condemnation of that singular sect or offset of the Franciscans, the Fraticelli, will form part of the history of that body, which perhaps did more than any other sects in preparation of the Lollards, of Wycliffe, perhaps of the great Reformation, in the minds of the people throughout Christendom, as the disseminators of doctrines essentially, vitally, anti-Papal.

CHAPTER IV.

HENRY OF LUXEMBURG. ITALY.

POPE CLEMENT — at the cost of much of the Papal dignity; at the cost of Christian mercy, even if the Templars, tortured and burned at the stake, were guilty; at the cost of truth and justice if they were innocent — had baffled the King of France, and had averted the fatal blow, the condemnation of Pope Boniface. Even of the spoils of the Templars he had rescued a large part, the whole landed property, out of the hands of the rapacious King; he had enriched himself, his death will hereafter show to what enormous amount. But the subtle Gascon had done greater service to Christendom by thwarting the views of the French monarch upon a predominance in the Western world dangerous to her liberties and welfare. Never was Europe in greater peril of falling, if not under one sovereignty, under the dominion, and that the most tyrannical dominion, of one house. Philip was king indeed in France: in many of his worst acts of oppression the nation, the commonalty itself, had backed the King. Even the Church, so long as he plundered and trampled on others, was on his side. The greater Metropolitan Sees were filled with his creatures. Princes of the house of France sat on the thrones of Naples and Hungary.

The feeble Edward II. of England was his son-in-law. The Empire, if obtained by Charles of Valois, had involved not merely the supreme rule in Germany, but the mastery in Italy. Clement would not have dared to refuse the imperial crown, and under such an Emperor where was the independence of the Italian cities? The Papal territory would have been held at his mercy.

The election of Henry of Luxemburg had redeemed Christendom from this danger. This election had been managed with unrivalled skill ^{Henry of Luxemburg.} by Peter Ashpalter, Archbishop of Mentz.¹ This remarkable man (an unusual case) was not of noble birth; he had been bred a physician; it was said that he had rendered the Pope great service by advice concerning his health, and had thus acquired a strong influence over his mind. Archbishop Peter first contrived the elevation of Henry's brother to the Electoral See of Treves. Two of the lay electors, out of jealousy towards the other competi- ^{Nov. 27, 1308.} tors for the crown, were won over. Henry of Luxemburg was proclaimed at Frankfort. The new King of the Romans was at once a just, a religious, and a popular sovereign.² He had put down the robbers, and exercised rigid but impartial justice in his own small territory. At the same time he was the most distinguished in arms. At the tournament no knight in Europe could unhorse Henry of Luxemburg. Soon after his elevation his indi-

¹ This is well told by Schmidt — *Geschichte der Deutschen*, vii. c. 4.

² *Justus et religiosus et in armis strenuus fuit. Hocsemius, apud Chapeauville, Hist. Pontif. Leoden. See the description of his person in Albert. Mussat. i. 13.*

gent house was enriched and strengthened by the marriage of his son with the heiress of Bohemia.

The Pope had taken no ostensible part in the election. When Henry of Luxemburg sent an embassy of nobles and great prelates to demand the imperial crown, Clement had no pretext, he had indeed no disposition, to refuse that which was in the common order of things. Philip might brood in secret over this politic attempt of the Pope after emancipation, yet had no right to take umbrage.

In a solemn diet at Spires Henry, King of the Romans, declared, amid universal acclamation, the imperial rights, and to receive the Cæsarean crown at Rome. Clement had never lost sight of the affairs of Italy: he was still Lord of Romagna, and drew his revenues from the Papal territory. But he had no Italian prepossessions. The Bishop of Rome had probably determined never to set his foot in that unruly city. His court was a court of French Cardinals, increased at each successive promotion. He had indeed interfered to save Pistoia from the cruel hands of Guelfic Florence; but Florence had treated

Diet at
Spies.

Aug. 21, 1309.

The Pope's
policy.

his threatened anathema with scorn. Bologna, struck with interdict by the angry Legate for aiding Florence, had made indeed submission, but not till she had forced the Legate to an ignominious flight to save his life. Clement had maintained a violent contest with Venice for Ferrara. Venice had struck a vigorous blow by the seizure of Ferrara, and the contemptuous refusal to acknowledge the asserted rights of the Pope in that city. The Venetians scorned the interdict thundered

against their whole territory by the Pope. Clement found a foe against whom he dared put forth all the terrors of his spiritual power. He prohibited all religious rites in Venice, declared the Doge and magistrates infamous, commanded all ecclesiastics to quit the territory except a few to baptize infants, and to administer extreme unction to the dying. If they persisted in their contumacy, he declared the Doge Gradenigo degraded from his high office, and all estates of Venetians confiscate; kings were summoned to take up arms against them till they should restore the rights of the Church. The Venetians condescended to send an ambassador; but as to the restoration of Ferrara, they made no sign of concession. But Venice was vulnerable through her wealth; the Pope struck a blow at her vital part. She had factories, vast stores of rich merchandise in every great haven, in every distant land. The Pope issued a brief, summoning all Kings, all rulers, all cities to plunder the forfeited merchandise of Venice, and to reduce the Venetians to slavery. The Pope's admonitions to peace, his warnings to kings and nations to abstain from unchristian injury to each other, had long lost their power. But a Papal license or rather exhortation to plunder, to plunder peaceful and defenceless factories, was too tempting an act of obedience. Everywhere their merchandise was seized, their factories pillaged, their traders outraged.¹ Venice quailed; yet it needed the utmost activity in the warlike Legate, the Cardinal Pelagru, at the head of troops from

¹ "Quâ de re data pluribus provinciis ac Regibus imperia." — Raynaldus sub ann., with authorities.

all quarters, to reconquer Ferrara. He slew six thousand men.

On a sudden Clement totally changed the immemorial policy of the Popes. He did not throw off, but he quietly let fall, the French alliance: he was in close league with the Emperor: ¹ the Pope became a Ghibelline. If the Papal and Imperial banners were not unfolded together, the Papal Legate was by the side of the Emperor. The refractory cities were menaced with the concurrent ban of the Empire and the excommunication of the Church.

Henry, rather more than a year after the Diet at
Henry in
Italy.
Oct. 23, 1310. Spires, descended upon Italy, but with no considerable German force,² to achieve that in which had been discomfited the Othos, Henrys, and Fredericks. Guelfs and Ghibellines watched his movements with unquiet jealousy. He assumed a lofty superiority to all factious views.³ The cities Turin, Asti, Vercelli, Novara, opened their gates.⁴ Henry reinstated the exiled Guelfs in Ghibelline, the Ghibellines in Milan. Guelfic cities. He approached Milan. Guido della Torre, the head of the ruling Guelfic faction, had sent a message to the King at Spires, "he would lead him with a falcon on his wrist, as on a pleasure-party,

¹ See Clement's letter to Henry of Luxemburg, July 26, 1309. Also the Treaty dated at Lausanne September 11, 1310. — *Monumenta Germaniæ*, iv. 501.

² Ferretus Vicentinus gives 5000 Germans.

³ "Cujusquam cum subjectis pactionis impatiens, Gibolenge Guelfeve partium mentionem abhorrens, cuncta absoluto amplectens imperio." — Alb. Mussat. i. 13.

⁴ See *Iter Italicum* by Henry's favorite counsellor. The Bishop of Buthronto gives a lively account of all his march, especially of the Bishop's own personal adventures. It has been reprinted (after Reuber and Muratori) by Boehmer. — *Fontes Rer. German.* i. 69.

through all Lombardy." Guido was now irresolute. The Archbishop of Milan, the nephew of Guido, but his mortal enemy, entreated the King's good offices for the release of three of his kindred, imprisoned by Della Torre. King Henry issued his orders; Guido refused to obey. Yet Milan did not close her gates on the King. Guido occupied the palace of the commonalty; he would not dismiss his armed guard of one thousand men. Besides this, he had at his command in one street ten thousand men, not, he averred, against the King, but against his enemy, the Archbishop. Henry lodged in the Archbishop's palace, and there kept his Christmas. On the day after, peace was sworn between Guido della Torre, his nephew the Archbishop, and Matteo Visconti: they exchanged the kiss of peace.¹ On the Epiphany Henry was crowned with the Iron Crown of Italy, not at Monza, but in the Ambrosian Church at Milan; the people wept tears of joy. Guido gave up the palace of the commonalty to the King. All the cities of Lombardy were present by their Syndics; all took the oath of allegiance except Genoa and Venice, who nevertheless acknowledged the supremacy of the King.² Henry calmly pursued his work of pacification. He placed Vicars in the cities from the Alps to Bologna, and forced them to admit the exiles. Como received the Guelfs, the Ghibellines entered Brescia. Mantua admitted the Ghibellines, Piacenza the Guelfs. Verona alone obstinately refused to receive Count Boniface and the Guelfs: her strong

¹ "Amicabiliter, utinam fideliter osculati." — *Iter Ital.*

² "They said many things to excuse themselves from swearing (writes the Bishop of Buthronto), which I do not recollect, excepting that they (the Venetians) are a quintessence, and will belong neither to the Church nor to the Emperor, nor to the sea nor to the land." — *Iter Italicum*, p. 893.

walls defied the Emperor. In Milan the leaders of the factions vied in their offerings to Henry. William di Posterla proposed a vote of fifty thousand florins, but added a donative to the Empress. Guido della Torre outbid his rival: "We are a great and wealthy city; one hundred thousand is not too much for so noble a sovereign." The Germans were alienated from the parsimonious Visconti; Guido, they averred, was the Emperor's friend; but it was shrewdly suspected that the crafty leader foresaw that Milan, when the tax came to be levied, would rise to shake off the burden. The Emperor, to secure the city in his absence, demanded that fifty of the great nobles and leaders, chosen half from the Guelfs, half from the Ghibellines, should accompany him to Rome to do honor to his coronation. The Guelfs were to name twenty-five Ghibellines, the Ghibellines twenty-five Guelfs. But this mode of election failed; neither Guido nor Visconti would quit the city. Guido alleged ill health; Feb. 12. the King's physician declared the excuse false. But the assessment of this vast sum, though the Germans were astonished at the ease with which much had been paid, inflamed the people. Frays broke out between the Germans and the Milanese; proc-
Insurrection in Milan. lamations were issued, forbidding the Italians to bear arms. On a sudden a cry was heard, "Death to the Germans! Peace between the Lord Guido and the Lord Matteo!" Visconti was seized, carried before the King, and dismissed unharmed. The Germans rushed to arms; they were joined by Visconti's faction; much slaughter, much plunder ensued.¹

¹ "Multi mortui et vulnerati, si justè Deus scit." So writes the pious Bishop, who had apprehended and, as he says, saved the life of, Visconti.

Guido della Torre fled; his palace fortress was surprised and ransacked: great stores of military weapons were found, arrows tipped with Greek fire, and balists.

No sooner was Milan heard to be in insurrection, than Crema, Cremona, Lodi, Brescia, rose. May 19, 1811. The first were speedily subdued; Cremona Siege of Brescia. severely punished. Brescia alone stood an obstinate siege. The Emperor's brother Waleran fell in the trenches: many Germans were hanged upon the walls. The new alliance between the Emperor and the Pope was here ostentatiously proclaimed. Two of the cardinals appointed to crown the Emperor, the Bishops of St. Sabina and of Ostia, appeared under the walls of Brescia. The gates flew open: they passed the streets amid acclamations — "Long live our Mother the Church; long live the Pope and the Holy Cardinals." The Cardinal of Ostia addressed the commonalty in a lofty harangue. He sternly reproved them for not having received that blessed son of the Church, Henry King of the Romans, who came in the name of the Lord: "They were in insurrection against the ordinance of Almighty God, against the monitions of the Pope: they must look for no better fate than befell Sodom and Gomorrah." The Captain of the people answered in their name — "They were ready to obey the Pope and a lawful Emperor. Henry was no emperor, but a spoiler, who expelled the Guelfs from the cities, and gave them up to the tyranny of the Ghibellines; he was reviving the schism of the Emperor Frederick." The Cardinals withdrew for a time in ignominious silence. Brescia still held out: Henry urged the Cardinals to issue a sentence of excommunication. "For excommunication," was the reply, "the

Italians care nothing. How have the Florentines treated that of the Cardinal of Ostia, the Bolognese that of Cardinal Napoleon, those of Milan that of the Lord Pelagius?"¹ Famine at length reduced the obstinate town. They consented to the mediation of the Cardinals, and Henry entered Brescia. The want of money led him to compound for the treason by a mulct of 70,000 florins. Henry's poverty compelled him to other acts, ignominious, even treacherous, as it seemed to his most loyal counsellors.²

Henry advanced to Genoa: the city submitted in Sept. 18-21. the amplest manner. But no sooner had the Emperor left Lombardy than a new Guelfic league sprung up behind him. Throughout Italy, the Guelfs, more Papalist than the Pope, disclaimed the Emperor, though under the escort of cardinal legates. At Genoa, died his Queen, Margarita. To Genoa came ambassadors from the head of the Guelfs, Robert King of Naples. Negotiations were commenced for a marriage between the houses of Luxemburg and Naples; but Robert demanded the office of Senator of Rome, and before terms could be concluded, news arrived that John, brother of King Robert, was in Rome with an armed force. Henry moved to Ghibelline Pisa; he was welcomed with joy. In the mean

March 6,
1312.

¹ Albert Mussato apud Muratori, R. I. S. I have endeavored to reconcile this account with the *Iter Italicum*. I understand the same fact to be alluded to, page 900: "Domini Cardinales de pace laboraverunt."

² "I protested, but protested in vain" (writes the Bishop of Buthronto), "against five acts of my master. To the doubtful Philip of Savoy he granted, for a loan of 25,000 florins, the lordship over Pavia, Vercelli, Novara: to Matteo Visconti, for 50,000, that of Milan: to Guilberto di Corregio, the Guelfic tyrant of Parma, for an unknown sum, that of Reggio: to Can di Verona, who obstinately refused to admit a single Guelf, that of Verona: to Passerino, that of Mantua." — *Iter Italicum*, p. 93.

time Guelfic Florence not merely would not admit Pandulph Savelli, the Pope's Notary, and the Bishop of Buthronto, Henry's ambassadors; they threatened to seize them, as loaded with gold to bribe the 'Ghibellines to insurrection. The ambassadors had many wild adventures in the Apennines, were plundered, in peril of captivity. Some Tuscan cities, more Tuscan lords, swore allegiance to the Emperor, whether from loyalty or hatred of Florence. The ambassadors arrived before Rome.¹ The city was occupied by John of Naples. He was strong enough to maintain himself in the city, not strong enough to keep down the Imperialists. There was parley, delay, exchange of demands. John insisted on fortifying the Ponte Molle. To the demand, among others, of coöperation in reconciling the rival houses of Orsini and Colonna, he sternly answered, "The Colonnas are my enemies; with them I will have neither truce nor treaty." He at length hurled defiance against the Emperor.

Henry himself set out from Pisa, and advanced towards Rome at the head of two thousand horse. With King Robert of Naples it was Henry advances on Rome. neither peace nor war. Prince John still held the Ponte Molle. On the appearance of King Henry he was summoned to withdraw his troops. He withdrew, he said, "for his own ends—not at the Emperor's command." The Germans charged over the bridge; a tower still manned by Neapolitans hurled down missiles; it was with difficulty stormed. The Pope's Emperor, with the Cardinals commissioned by the Pope to crown him, entered Rome: he occupied, with the Ghibellines, the city on one side of the Tiber; the

¹ This is the most curious part of the *Iter Italicum*.

Capitol was forced to submit. Beyond the Tiber were John of Naples and the Guelfic Orsini. Neither had strength to dispossess the other. But St. Peter's was in the power of the enemy. The magnificent ceremonial, which Pope Clement had drawn out at great length for the coronation of Henry, could not take place. He must submit to receive the crown

June 29, 1312. with humbler pomp in the Church of St. John Lateran. The inglorious coronation took place on the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul.

The heats of Rome compelled the Emperor to retire to Tivoli. A year of war ensued: Florence placed herself at the head of the anti-Imperialist League. Henry, having made a vain attempt to surprise Florence, retired to Pisa. There he pronounced the ban of the Empire against Florence and the contumacious cities; and against Robert of Naples, whom Feb. 12, 1313. he declared, as a rebellious vassal, deposed from his throne. The ban of the Empire had no more terror than the excommunication of the Pope. Henry awaited forces from Germany to open again the campaign: his magnanimous character struck even his adversaries. "He was a man," writes the Guelf Villani, "never depressed by adversity, never in prosperity elated with pride, or intoxicated with joy."

But the end of his career drew on. He had now advanced at the head of an army which his enemies dared not meet in the field, towards Sienna. He rode still, seemingly in full vigor and activity. But the fatal air of Rome had smitten his strength. A carbuncle had formed under his knee; injudicious remedies inflamed his vitiated blood. He died at Buonconvento in the midst of his awe-struck army, on the Festival

of St. Bartholomew. Rumors of foul practice, of course, spread abroad: a Dominican monk was said to have administered poison in the Sacrament, which he received with profound devotion. ^{Aug. 24, 1313.} His body was carried in sad state, and splendidly interred at Pisa.

So closed that empire, in which, if the more factious and vulgar Ghibellines beheld their restoration to their native city, their triumph, their revenge, their sole administration of public affairs, the nobler Ghibellinism of Dante¹ foresaw the establishment of a great universal monarchy necessary to the peace and civilization of mankind. The ideal sovereign of Dante's famous treatise on Monarchy was Henry of ^{Dante de Monarchia.} Luxemburg. Neither Dante nor his time can be understood but through this treatise. The attempt of the Pope to raise himself to a great Pontifical monarchy had manifestly, ignominiously failed: the Ghibelline is neither amazed nor distressed at this event. It is now the turn of the Imperialist to unfold his noble vision. "An universal monarchy is absolutely necessary for the welfare of the world;" and this is part of his singular reasoning — "Peace" (says the weary exile, the man worn out in cruel strife, the wanderer from city to city, each of those cities more fiercely torn by faction than the last), "universal Peace is the first blessing of mankind. The angels sang not riches or pleasures, but

¹ Read first Dante's rapturous letter (in Italian) to the princes and people of Italy before the descent of Henry of Luxemburg (the Latin original is lost), Fraticelli's edition, Oper. Min. iii. p. 2, 23. "Non riluca in maravigliose effette Iddio avere predestinato il Romano principe?" The Pope is now on the Imperial side, and Dante is conciliatory even to an Avignonese Pope. Nor omit, secondly, the furious letter to Henry himself, almost reproaching him with leaving wicked Florence unchastised. — Ibid. p. 230.

peace on earth: peace the Lord bequeathed to his disciples. For peace One must rule. Mankind is most like God when at unity, for God is One; therefore under a monarchy. Where there is parity there must be strife; where strife, judgment; the judge must be a third party intervening with supreme authority." Without monarchy can be no justice, nor even liberty; for Dante's ¹ monarch is no arbitrary despot, but a constitutional sovereign; he is the Roman law impersonated in the Emperor; a monarch who should leave all the nations, all the free Italian cities, in possession of their rights and old municipal institutions.

But to this monarchy of the world the Roman people has an inherent, indefeasible right. The Saviour was born when the world was at peace under the Roman sway.² Dante seizes and applies the texts, which foreshow the peaceful dominion of Christianity, to the Empire of old Rome. Rome assumed that empire of right, not of usurpation. The Romans were the noblest of people by their descent from Æneas, the noblest of men. The rise of the Republic was one continual miracle: the Ancile, the repulse of the Gauls, Clelia, all were miracles in the highest sense.³ That holy, pious, and glorious people sacrificed its own advantage to the common good. It ruled the world by its beneficence. All that the most ardent Christian could assert of the best of the Saints, Dante attributes to the older Romans. The great examples of human virtue are

¹ "Et humanum genus, potissimum liberum, optime se habet."

² "Quare fremuerunt gentes, reges adversantur Domino suo et uncto sub Romano Principe."

³ "Quod etiam pro Romano Imperio perficiendo, miranda Deus pertenderet illustrium authorum testimonio comprobatur." The authors are Livy and Lucan.

Cincinnatus, Fabricius, Camillus, Decius, Cato. The Roman people are by nature predestined to rule: he cites the irrefragable authority of Virgil.¹ There are two arguments which strangely mingle with these. Rome had won the empire of the world by wager of battle. God, in the great ordeal, had adjudged the triumph to Rome: he had awarded to her the prize, universal, indefeasible monarchy.² Still further, "Our Lord condescended to be put to death under Pilate, the vicegerent of Tiberius Cæsar; by that he acknowledged the lawfulness of the jurisdiction, therefore the jurisdiction is of God."³ But while all this argument of Dante shows the irresistible magic power still possessed over the imagination by the mere name of Rome, how strongly does it illustrate not only the coming days of Rienzi, but the strength, too, which the Papal power had derived from this indelible awe, this unquestioning admission that the world owed allegiance to Rome! Dante proceeds to prove that the monarchy, the Roman monarchy, is held directly of God, not of any Vicar or minister of God. He sweeps away with contemptuous hand all the later Decretals. He admits the Holy Scripture, the first Councils, the early Doctors, and St. Augustine. He spurns the favorite texts of the sun and moon as typifying the Papacy and the Empire, the worship of the Magi, the two swords, the donation of Constantine. He asserts Christ to be the only Rock of the Church. The examples of authority assumed

¹ "Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento."

² "Nullum dubium est quin prævalentia in athletis pro imperio mundi certantibus, Dei judicium est sequuta. Romanus populus cunctis athletigantibus pro imperio mundi prævaluit." — p. 100. "Quod per duellum acquiritur jure acquiritur."

³ We find even the startling sentence, "Si Romanum Imperium de jure non fuit, peccatum adeo in Christo non fuit punitum."

by Popes over Emperors, he confronts with precedents of authority used by Emperors over Popes. Dante denies not, he believes with the fervor of a devout Catholic, the coördinate supremacy of the Church and the Empire, of the Pope and the temporal monarch; but like all the Ghibellines, like the Fraticelli among the lower orders, like many other true believers, almost worshippers of the successor of St. Peter, he would absolutely, rigidly, entirely confine him to his spiritual functions; with this life the Pontiff had no concern, eternal life was in his power and arbitration alone.¹

Italy, at the death of Henry of Luxemburg, fell back into her old anarchy. Clement, it is true, laid claim to the Empire during the vacancy, but it was an idle and despised boast.² The Transalpine Clement was succeeded by other Transalpine Popes; but the confederacy between the Pope and the Emperor broke up forever at the death of Henry.

¹ This is the key to Dante's Imperialism and Papalism. Hence in the lowest pit of hell, the two traitors to Cæsar are on either side of the traitor to Christ. "Bruto, Iscariote, e Cassio." Hence both his fierce Ghibelline denunciations of the avarice and pride of Boniface, and his indignation at the violation of the sanctity of Christ's Vicar at Anagni. Throughout, the imperial authority is the first necessity of Italy —

" Ahi gentè, chè dovesti esser devota,
E lasciar seder Cæsar nella sella,
Se bene intendi ciò ch'è Dio ti nota."

This is followed by the magnificent apostrophe to Albert of Austria, whose guilt in neglecting Italy is not only avenged on his own posterity, but on his successor, Henry of Luxemburg, —

" Vieni a veder *la tua* Roma, che piagni
Vedova è sola, e di è notte chiama,
Cesare mio, perchè non m' accompagni."

— Compare Foscolo, Discorso, p. 223.

² "Nos tam ex superioritate quam ad Imperium non est dubium nos habere, quoniam ex potestate, in qua, vacante Imperio, Imperatori succedimus." — Clement. Pastoral. Muratori, Ann. sub ann. 1314.

CHAPTER V.

THE END OF DU MOLAY, OF POPE CLEMENT, OF KING
PHILIP.

THE end of Clement himself and of Clement's master, the King of France, drew near. The Pope had been compelled to make still larger concessions to the King. Philip's annexation of the Imperial city, Lyons, and the extinction of the rights or claims of the Archbishop to an independent jurisdiction, were vainly encountered by remonstrance. From this time Lyons became a city of the kingdom of France.

But the Pope and the King must be preceded into the realm of darkness and to the judgment-seat of heaven by other victims. The tragedy of the Templars had not yet drawn to its close. The four great dignitaries of the Order, the Grand Master Du Molay, Guy the Commander of Normandy, son of the Dauphin of Auvergne, the Commander of Aquitaine Godfrey de Gonaville, the great Visitor of France Hugues de Peraud, were still pining in the royal dungeons. It was necessary to determine on their fate. The King and the Pope were now equally interested in burying the affair forever in silence and oblivion. So long as these men lived, uncondemned, undoomed, the Order was not extinct. A commission was named; the Cardinal Archbishop of Albi, with two other Cardinals, two monks, the Cistercian Arnold Novelli, and Arnold

de Fargis, nephew of Pope Clement, the Dominican Nicolas de Freveauville, akin to the house of Marigny, formerly the King's confessor. With these the Archbishop of Sens sat in judgment, on the Knights' own former confessions. The Grand Master and the rest were found guilty, and were to be sentenced to perpetual imprisonment.¹

A scaffold was erected before the porch of Notre Dame. On one side appeared the two Cardinals; on the other the four noble prisoners, in chains, under the custody of the Provost of Paris. Six years of dreary imprisonment had passed over their heads; of their valiant brethren the most valiant had been burned alive; the recreants had purchased their lives by confession: the Pope in a full Council had condemned and dissolved the Order. If a human mind, a mind, like that of Du Molay, not the most stubborn, could be broken by suffering and humiliation, it must have yielded to this long and crushing imprisonment. The Cardinal-Archbishop of Albi ascended a raised platform: he read the confessions of the Knights, the proceedings of the Court; he enlarged on the criminality of the Order, on the holy justice of the Pope, and the devout, self-sacrificing zeal of the King; he was proceeding to the final, the fatal sentence. At that instant the Grand Master advanced; his gesture implored silence: judges and people gazed in awe-struck apprehension. In a calm, clear voice Du Molay spake: "Before heaven and earth, on the verge of death, where the least falsehood bears like an intolerable weight upon the soul, I protest that we have richly deserved death, not on account of any

Prisoners
brought up
for sentence.

Speech of
Du Molay.

¹ "Muro et carceri perpetuo retrudendi." — Continuat. Nangis.

heresy or sin of which ourselves or our Order have been guilty, but because we have yielded, to save our lives, to the seductive words of the Pope and of the King: and so by our confessions brought shame and ruin on our blameless, holy, and orthodox brotherhood.”

The Cardinals stood confounded; the people could not suppress their profound sympathy. The assembly was hastily broken up; the Provost was commanded to conduct the prisoners back to their dungeons. “To-morrow we will hold further counsel.”

But on the moment that the King heard these things, without a day's delay, without the least consultation with the ecclesiastical authorities, he ^{Death of Du Molay.} ordered them to death as relapsed heretics. In the island on the Seine, where now stands the statue of Henry IV., between the King's garden on one side and the convent of the Augustinian monks on the other, the two pyres were raised (two out of the four had shrunk back into their ignoble confessions). It was the hour of vespers when these two aged and noble men were led out to be burned: they were tied each to the stake. The flames kindled dully and heavily; the wood, hastily piled up, was green or wet; or, in cruel mercy, the tardiness was designed that the victims might have time, while the fire was still curling round their extremities, to recant their bold recantation. But there was no sign, no word of weakness. Du Molay implored that the image of the Mother of God might be held up before him,¹ and his hands unchained,

¹ “ Et je vous prie
Que de vers la visage Marie,
Dont notre Seigneur Christ fust nez,
Mon visage vous me tornez.”

Godfrey de Paris.

that he might clasp them in prayer. Both, as the smoke rose to their lips, as the fire crept up to their vital parts, continued solemnly to aver the innocence, the Catholic faith of the Order. The King himself sat and beheld,¹ it might seem without remorse, this hideous spectacle; the words of Du Molay might have reached his ears. But the people looked on with far other feelings. Stupor kindled into admiration; the execution was a martyrdom; friars gathered up their ashes and bones and carried them away, hardly by stealth, to consecrated ground; they became holy relics.² The two who wanted courage to die pined away their miserable life in prison.

The wonder and the pity of the times which immediately followed, arrayed Du Molay not only in the robes of the martyr, but gave him the terrible language of a prophet. "Clement, iniquitous and cruel judge, I summon thee within forty days to meet me before the throne of the Most High."³ According to some accounts this fearful sentence included the King, by whom, if uttered, it might have been heard. The earliest allusion to this awful speech does not contain that striking particularity, which, if part of it, would be fatal to its credibility, the precise date

¹ "Ambo rege spectante," Zantifliet. He adds that he had this from an eye-witness — "qui hæc vidit scriptori testimonium præbuit." The Canon of Liege is said to have been born towards the end of the fourteenth century. Could he have conversed with an eye-witness of this scene on March 11, 1313? But many of these chronicles are those of the convent rather than of the individual monks. This was continued to 1462. See above.

² "Villani (St. Antoninus as usual copies Villani), E nota che la notte appresso chel' detto maestro e 'l compagno furono marterizzati, per frati religiosi le loro corpora ed ossa come reliquie sante furono raccolte e portate via in sacri luogi."

³ Ferretus Vicentinus.

of Clement's death. It was not till the year after that Clement and King Philip passed to their account. The poetic relation of Godfrey of Paris¹ simply states that Du Molay declared that God would revenge their death on their unrighteous judges. The rapid fate of these two men during the next year might naturally so appall the popular imagination, as to approximate more closely the prophecy and its accomplishment. At all events it betrayed the deep and general feeling of the cruel wrong inflicted on the Order; while the unlamented death of the Pope, the disastrous close of Philip's reign, and the disgraceful crimes which attainted the honor of his family seemed as declarations of Heaven as to the innocence of their noble victims.²

The health of Clement V. had been failing for some time. From his Court, which he held at Car-
Death of
Clement.
April 20, 1314.
 pentras, he set out in hopes to gain strength from his native air at Bordeaux. He had hardly crossed the Rhone when he was seized with mortal sickness at Roquemaure. The Papal treasure was seized by his followers, especially his nephew; his re-

¹ "S'en vendra en brief temps meschie,
 Sur celz qui nous dampnent a tort
 Dieu en vengera nostre mort,
 Seignors, dit il, sachiez sans tere,
 Que tous celz qui nous sont contrère
 Por nous en uront a soupir."

Godfrey de Paris.

² Besides other evidence, a singular document but recently brought to light establishes the date of the execution of Du Molay, March 11, 1313. The Abbot and Convent of St. Germain aux Près claimed jurisdiction over the island where the execution took place. They complained of the execution as an infringement on their rights. The Parliament of Paris decided in their favor. — *Les Olim*, published by M. Beugnot, Documents Inédits, t. ii. p. 599.

mains were treated with such utter neglect that the torches set fire to the catafalque under which he lay, not in state. His body, covered only with a single sheet, all that his rapacious retinue had left to shroud their forgotten master, was half burned (not, like those of the Templars, his living body) before alarm was raised. His ashes were borne back to Carpentras and solemnly interred.¹

Clement left behind him evil fame. He died shame-Character. fully rich. To his nephew (nepotism had begun to prevail in its baneful influence) he bequeathed not less than 300,000 golden florins, under the pretext of succor to the Holy Land. He had died still more wealthy, but that his wealth was drained by more disgraceful prodigality. It was generally believed that the beautiful Brunisand de Foix, Countess of Talleyrand Perigord, was the Pope's mistress: to her he was boundlessly lavish, and her influence was irresistible even in ecclesiastical matters. Rumor ran that her petitions to the lustful Pontiff were placed upon her otherwise unveiled bosom. Italian hatred of a Transalpine Pope, Guelfic hatred of a Ghibelline Pope, may have lent too greedy ear to these disreputable reports: but the large mass of authorities is against the Pope; in his favor hardly more than suspicious silence.²

Yet was it the ambition of Clement to be one of the ecclesiastical legislators of Christendom. He had hoped that his new book of Decretals would have been enrolled during his life with those of his predecessors. It was published on the 12th of March, but the death of

¹ Franciscus Pepinus in Chronico.

² Villani, ix. 58. The Guelfic Villani. "Contra ejus pudicitiam fama laboravit." — Albert. Mussat. p. 606. Hist. Languedoc, xxix. 35, 138.

Clement took place before it had assumed its authority.

From Boniface VIII. to Clement V. was indeed a precipitous fall. After this time subtle policy rather than conscious power became the ruling influence of the Popedom. The Popes had ceased absolutely to command, but they had not ceased to a great extent to govern. Nor in these new arts of government was Clement without considerable skill and address. Notwithstanding his abandonment of Rome, his dangerous neighborhood to the King of France, his general subserviency to his hard master, his doubtful, at least, if not utterly disreputable personal character, his looseness and his rapacity, he had succeeded in saving the fame of his predecessor, in averting the fatal blow to the Popedom of which it had been impossible to conceive the consequences — he had prevented the condemnation of a Pope as a notorious heretic and a man of criminal life — his disinterment, on which Philip at one time insisted, and the public burning of his body. Clement succeeded by calm, stubborn determination, by watching his time, and wisely calculating the amount of sacrifice which would content the resentful and vengeful King. His other great service to Christendom was the preservation of Europe from the absolute domination of France. If indeed Henry of Luxemburg had established the imperial dominion in Italy in the absence of the Pope, it is difficult to speculate on the results. Clement himself took alarm: he yielded promptly to the demands of the King of France, and inhibited the war waged against Philip's kinsman, King Robert of Naples, as against a vassal of the Church. He looked with distrust on Henry's

league with the anti-papal House of Arragon, with Frederick of Sicily. The Pope might have been constrained ere long to become again a Guelf.

Philip the Fair survived Pope Clement only a few months.¹ Philip, at forty-six, was an old and worn-out man. Though he had raised the royal power to such unprecedented height; though he had laid the foundation of free institutions, not to be developed to maturity; though successful in most of his wars; though he had curbed, at least, the rebellious Flemings, added provinces to his realm, above all the great city of Lyons; though in close alliance, by marriage, with England; though he had crushed the Templars, and obtained much wealth from his share of the spoil; though the Church of France was filled in its highest sees by his creatures; though the Pope was under his tutelage, most of the Cardinals his subjects: yet the last years of his reign were years of difficulty, disaster, and ignominy. His financial embarrassments, notwithstanding his financial iniquities, grew worse and worse. The spoils of the Templars were soon dissipated. His tampering with the coin of the kingdom became more reckless, more directly opposed to all true economy, more burdensome and hateful to his subjects, less lucrative to the Crown.² The Lombards, the Jews, had been again admitted into the realm, again to be plundered, again expelled. The magnificent festival at Paris, where he received the King of England with unexampled splendor, consummated his bankruptcy.

But upon his house there had fallen what wounded

Poverty of
Philip.

¹ Clement died April 20, Philip Nov. 29, 1314.

² Compare Sismondi.

the haughty, chivalrous, and feudal feelings of the times more than did the violation of high Christian morals. The wives of his three sons, Disgrace of Philip's family. the handsomest men of their day, were at the same time accused of adultery, and with men of low birth. The paramours of Marguerite and of Blanche, daughters of Otho IV. and the wives of Louis and Charles, the elder and younger sons of Philip, were two Norman gentlemen, Philip and Walter de Launoi. Confession, true or false, was wrung from these men by torture; but confession only made their doom more dreadful. They were mutilated, flayed alive, hung up by the most sensitive parts to die a lingering death.¹ Many persons, men and women, of high and low rank, were tortured to admit criminal connivance in the crimes of the princesses: some were sewed up in sacks and cast into the river, some burned alive, some hanged. The atrocity of the punishments shows how deeply the disgrace sank into the heart of the King, himself too cold and severe to indulge such weaknesses. Marguerite and Blanche were shaven and shut up in Château-Gaillard. Marguerite was afterwards strangled, that her husband might marry again: Blanche divorced on the plea of parentage. Her splendid dowry alone saved the life, if not the honor, of Jane of Burgundy, the wife of the second son, Philip of Poitiers. She had brought him the sovereignty of Franche Comté, which he would forfeit by her death or divorce. Jane was shut up; no paramour was produced: the Parliament of Paris declared her guiltless, and Philip received her again to all the dignity of her station.

In this attainder to the honor of the royal house of

¹ Contin. Nangis, p. 68. Chroniq. de St. Denys, p. 146.

France some beheld the vengeance of Heaven for the sacrilegious outrage at Anagni; others for the iniquitous persecution of the Templars.¹

Philip had fallen into great languor, yet was able to amuse himself with hunting. A wild boar ran under the legs of his horse, and overthrew him. He was carried to Fontainebleau, and died with all outward demonstrations of piety. The persecutor of Popes, the persecutor of the great religious Order of Knighthood, had always shown the most submissive reverence for the offices of the Church; he had been most rigid in the proscription of heresy or of suspected heresy. The fires had received one more victim, Margu rite de la Porette, who had written a book of too ardent piety on the Love of God.² Philip died, giving the sagest advice to his sons of moderation, mercy, devotion to the Church; lessons which he seemed to lull himself to a quiet security that he had ever fulfilled to the utmost.³

It is singular, even in these dark times, to see Christianity still strong at her extremities, still making conquests upon Heathenism. The Order of the Knights

¹ "Forse per lo peccato commesso per loro padre, nella presura di Papa Bonifazio, come il Vescovo d' Ansiona profettizz , e forse per quello, che adoper  ne' Templari, come   detto addietro." — G. Villani, ix. 65.

² Continuat. Nangis. Sismondi, *Hist. des Fran ais*, ix. p. 286.

³ After the death of Philip's Queen, unless belied, one of the most lustful of women, Guichard Bishop of Troyes was arrested on suspicion of having poisoned her. He was tried before the Archbishop of Sens and the Bishops of Orleans and Auxerre. The proofs failed, but the Bishop was kept in prison. Nor, though another man accused himself of the crime, was the Bishop reinstated in his see. — Contin. Nangis, p. 61. Compare Michelet, *Hist. des Fran ais*, vol. iv. c. 5.

Templars had come to a disastrous and ignominious end. The Knights of St. John or of the Hospital, now that the Holy Land was irrecoverably lost, had planted themselves in Rhodes, as a strong outpost and bulwark of Christendom, which they held for some centuries against the Turco-Mohammedan power; and, when it fell, almost buried themselves in its ruins. At the same time, less observed, less envied, less famous, the Teutonic Order was winning to itself from heathendom (more after the example of Charlemagne than of Christ's Apostles) a kingdom, of which the Order was for a time to be the Sovereign, and which hereafter, conjoined with one of the great German Principalities, was to become an important state, the kingdom of Prussia.

The Orders of the Temple and of St. John owed, the former their foundation, the latter their power and wealth, to noble Knights. They were military and aristocratic brotherhoods, which hardly deigned to receive, at least in their higher places, any but those of gentle birth. The first founders of the Teutonic Order were honest, decent, and charitable burghers of Lubeck and Bremen. After the disasters which followed the death of Frederick Barbarossa, when the army was wasting away with disease and famine before Acre, these merchants from the remote shores of the Baltic ran up the sails of their ships into tents to receive the sick and starving. They were joined by the brethren of a German Hospital, which had been before founded in Jerusalem, and had been permitted by the contemptuous compassion of Saladin to remain for some time in the city. Duke Frederick of Swabia saw the advantage of a German Order, both to maintain the German

interests and to relieve the necessities of German pilgrims. Their first house was in Acre.¹

But it was not till the Mastership of Herman of Salza that the Teutonic Order emerged into distinction. That remarkable man has been seen adhering in unshaken fidelity to the fortunes of the Emperor Frederick II.;² and Frederick no doubt more highly honored the Teutonic Order because it was commanded by Herman of Salza, and more highly esteemed Herman of Salza as Master of an Order which alone in Palestine did not thwart, oppose, insult the German Emperor. It is the noblest testimony to the wisdom, unimpeached virtue, honor, and religion of Herman of Salza, that the successive Popes, Honorius III., Gregory IX., Innocent IV., who agreed with Frederick in nothing else, with whom attachment to Frederick was enmity and treason to the Church or absolute impiety, nevertheless vied with the Emperor in the honor and respect paid to the Master Herman, and in grants and privileges to his Teutonic Knights.

The Order, now entirely withdrawn, as become useless, from the Holy Land, had found a new sphere for their crusading valor: the subjugation and conversion of the heathen nations to the south-east and the east of the Baltic.³ Theirs was a complete Mohammedan invasion, the Gospel or the sword. The avowed object

¹ Compare Voigt, *Geschichte Preussens*, and authorities.

² See vol. v. p. 505.

³ Pomerania had been converted in a more Christian manner in the twelfth century, chiefly by the exertions of Bishop Otho of Bamberg, whose romantic life with that of his convert, Prince Mitzlav, has been well wrought by my nephew, the Rev. R. Milman, into a Romance (I wish it had been History, or even Legend). I trust this note is pardonable nepotism. See also Mone, *Nordische Heidenthum*, or Schroeck, xxv. p. 221, &c, for a more historical view.

was the subjugation, the extermination if they would not be subjugated, of the Prussian, Lithuanian, Esthonian, and other kindred or conterminous tribes, because they were infidels. They had refused to listen to the pacific preachers of the Gospel, and pacific preachers had not been wanting. Martyrs to the faith had fallen on the dreary sands of Prussia, in the forests and morasses of Livonia and Esthonia.

The Pope and the Emperor concurred in this alone — in their right to grant away all lands, it might be kingdoms, won from unbelievers. The Charter of Frederick II. runs in a tone of as haughty supremacy as those of Honorius, Gregory, or Innocent IV.¹

These tribes had each their religion, the dearer to them as the charter of their liberty. It was wild, no doubt superstitious and sanguinary.² They are said to have immolated human victims.³ They burned slaves, like other valuables, on the graves of their departed great men.

For very many years the remorseless war went on. The Prussians rose and rose again in revolt; but the inexhaustible Order pursued its stern course. It became the perpetual German Crusade. Wherever there

¹ "Auctoritatem eidem magistro concedimus, terram Prussiæ cum viribus domûs, et totis conatibus invadendi, concedentes et confirmantes eidem magistro, successoribus ejus, et domui suæ in perpetuum, tam prædictam terram quam a præscripto duce recipiat ut promisit, et quancunque aliam dabit. Necnon terram, quam in partibus Prussiæ, Deo favente, conquirit, velut *vetus et* debitum jus Imperii, in montibus, planicie, fluminibus, nemoribus et in mari, ut eam liberam sine omni servitia et exactione teneant et immunem. Et nulli respondere proinde teneantur." — Grant of Frederick II., Voigt, *Geschichte Preussens*, iii. p. 440.

² Compare Mone, i. 79.

³ A burgher of Magdeburg was burned as a sacrifice to their gods by the Nantangian Prussians. The lot had fallen on him. A Nantangian chief begged him off, as having enjoyed his hospitality. Twice again he threw, still the lot was against him. He was immolated. — Voigt, iii. 206.

was a martial and restless noble, who found no adventure, or no enemy, in his immediate neighborhood; wherever the indulgences and rewards of this religious act, the fighting for the Cross, were wanted, without the toil, peril, and cost of a journey to the Holy Land, the old but now decried, now unpopular Crusade; whoever desired more promptly and easily to wash off his sins in the blood of the unbeliever, rushed into the Order, and either enrolled himself as a Knight, or served for a time under the banner. There is hardly a princely or a noble house in Germany which did not furnish some of its illustrious names to the roll of Teutonic Knights.

So at length, by their own good swords, and what Sovereignty of the Order. they no doubt deemed a more irrefragable title, the grants of Popes and Emperors, the Order became Sovereigns; a singular sovereignty, which descended, not by hereditary succession, but by the incorporation of new Knights into the Order. The whole land became the absolute property of the Order, to be granted out but to Christians only; apostasy forfeited all title to land.

Their subjects were of two classes: I. The old Prussian, converted to Christianity after the conquest. Baptism was the only way to become a freeman, a man. The conquered unbeliever who remained an unbeliever, was the slave, the property of his master, as much as his horse or hound. The three ranks which subsisted among the Prussians, as in most of the Teutonic and kindred tribes, remained under Christianity and the sovereignty of the Order. The great landowners, the owners of castles held immediately of the Order: their estates had descended from heathen times.

These were, 1, the Withings; 2, the lower vassals; and, 3, those which answered to the Leudes and Lita of the Germans, retained their rank and place in the social scale. All were bound to obey the call to war, to watch and ward; to aid in building and fortifying the castles and strongholds of the Order.

II. The German immigrants or colonists. These were all equally under the feudal sovereignty of the Order. The cities and towns were all German. The Prussian seems to have disdained or to have had no inclination to the burgher-life. There were also German villages, each under its Schultheiss, and with its own proper government.

Thus was Christendom pushing forward its borders. These new provinces were still added to the dominion of Latin Christianity. The Pope grants, the Teutonic Order hold their realm on the conjoint authority of the successor of Cæsar and of St. Peter. As a religious Order, they are the unreluctant vassals of the Pope; as Teutons, owe some undefined subordination to the Emperor.¹

¹ Voigt is a sufficient and trustworthy authority for this rapid sketch. The Order has its own historians, but neither is their style nor their subject attractive.



